

THE LIBRARY.


MARTIN MARPRELATE AND SHAKESPEARE'S FLUELLEN.

A NEW THEORY OF THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE MARPRELATE TRACTS.

'I'll tell you there is good men porn at Monmouth.'
—Fluellen.

'Given at my castle between two Wales' . . .
—Martin's 'Epistle.'

I.

HE Marprelate tracts are seven in number, if we include the broadside commonly known as 'The Minerals.' The first two, 'The Epistle' and 'Epitome,' were in preparation in May, 1588,¹ but 'The Epistle' was not printed till about 15th October, while its sequel followed at the end of the next month. Meanwhile Waldegrave, the printer, in fear of detection, was forced to move his press about from place to place, with the

¹ 'THE LIBRARY,' Second Series, X., 232.

assistance of the Welsh puritan reformer John Penry. At the beginning of February, 1589, he was lurking at Coventry, whence he issued, about the 20th, the broadside mentioned above, and just over a month later 'Hay any worke for Cooper,' the third of the tracts proper. Directly this was finished, he began to make preparations for leaving Coventry, and meeting one Sharpe, the bookbinder, afterwards the chief informer of the Martinist circle, he told him that he intended to go down into Devonshire to print Cartwright's answer to the Rhemish 'Testament,' for the copy of which he had long been waiting. Presumably, therefore, he went to Devonshire at the end of March. Sharpe informs us next that 'about May day' he met Penry, who told him that 'Waldegrave was surely in hand in some corner with the printing of Master Cartwright's "Testament," that he looked daily for his "Appellation" from him, and that then he should go in hand with "More work for Cooper."' Penry's reference to the last work shows that Waldegrave was still regarded as the Marprelate printer. He had taken with him, moreover, 'the Dutch letters' in which the first three 'Martins' had been printed. The next news we have of him is that he has gone to Rochelle. This Penry tells Sharpe in the second week of May. It was now necessary to obtain the services of a printer to take the place of Waldegrave, whom the Martinists appear to have looked upon henceforth in the light of a deserter.

¹ Arber, 'Introductory Sketch,' p. 100.

Towards the end of May one Hodgkins was engaged, but it is remarkable that though he had type and two presses to work with, nothing was done for two months after his engagement. It was, in fact, not until 22nd July that the next Martinist tract, known as 'Martin Junior,' appeared, and it was followed a week later by 'Martin Senior.' These publications were issued from Wolston near Coventry, and immediately afterwards Hodgkins moved to Manchester with the copy of 'More worke for Cooper,' where, on 14th August, he was captured by the authorities. This disaster silenced the Martinists for a time, and 'The Protestation,' the seventh and last of the series, did not appear until about the end of September.

It is necessary to remind ourselves of these elementary facts concerning the publication of the famous Marprelate tracts, if we are to understand the drift of the argument that follows. Of the authorship of the tracts we know nothing. At present there are two candidates for the honour—John Penry, who was chief director of the press and its movements from beginning to end; and Job Throckmorton, who appears upon the scene about the same time as Hodgkins, and takes an active interest in the production of 'Martin Junior,' 'Martin Senior,' and 'The Protestation.' I think it likely, as I shall show later, that both these men had a hand in writing the last three tracts; but I am convinced that neither was responsible for the first three—that is to say, 'The Epistle,' 'The Epitome,' and 'Hay any worke.' In other words, 'Martin Marprelate, gentleman,' is some third

person whom it is our business to discover. There are strong grounds for refusing to identify either Penry or Throckmorton with Martin himself. Most students of the tracts and of Penry's acknowledged work have long ago put him out of court for reasons of style. And we have it, on the authority of his intimate friend John Udall, that soon after 'The Epistle' was published, Penry 'wrote a letter to a friend in London, wherein he did deny it (*i.e.*, the authorship) with such terms as declare him to be ignorant and clear in it.'¹ Throckmorton, therefore, has hitherto been the favourite both with some Elizabethan and most modern students of the business. His behaviour was highly suspicious, and his style not very unlike Martin's. Yet in his case, too, we are met, as Martin himself would put it, 'with a flat *non plus*' in the oath which he offered to take in court 'that I am not Martin, I knew not Martin, and concerning what I stand indicted of, I am as clear as the child unborn.'² Furthermore, in spite of the evidence which we have against him, the authorities of the day left him unmolested; he appears to have been openly acquitted by a judge who investigated his case at Warwick; and Burghley himself, according to Throckmorton's own account, stated in Parliament 'that he knew the said Job Throckmorton to be an honest man.'²

Emptying our minds, therefore, of all preconceived theories about their authorship, let us take the tracts in our hands—as we may easily do now,

¹ Arber, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

² 'Defence of Job Throckmorton,' sig. E.ii.

thanks to Mr. Pierce's edition (James Clarke and Co., 1911)—and see if they can tell us anything about the man or men who wrote them. We have already noticed the four months of silence which elapsed between 'Hay any worke' (23rd March) and 'Martin Junior' (22nd July). This curious gap divides the series into two groups. But the division is not merely one of time. When the ball is set rolling again it is ostensibly two new writers who take up the pen—writers who call themselves the 'sons' of Martin Marprelate, and conceal their identity behind the pseudonyms, Martin Junior, Martin Senior. Still more interesting is it to observe that 'Martin Junior,' the earliest tract of the second group, contains a number of 'theses' which Martin Junior gives to the world in the condition in which he received them, declaring that they were 'set down and collected by that famous and renowned clerk, the reverend Martin Marprelate the great.' The said theses are curiously fragmentary and abrupt; many break off in the middle of the sentence, and of the last the only words given are 'That these prelates . . .' upon which Martin Junior comments: 'Here he left his writings unperfite and thus perfite begins the son.' All this, of course, is no new discovery. Nobody who reads the tracts can avoid noticing it. But hitherto it has been lightly passed over, as part of the Marprelate game, as a new device of Martin's to catch the ear of the public. Yet is it really nothing but 'flim flam'? Mr. Pierce for one sees in these broken sentences 'a loop-hole through which we may escape from all our

conjectures, and imagine some great and still unknown English reformer as the writer of the Marprelate tracts.¹ What if the peculiar features of 'Martin Junior' and 'Martin Senior,' which we have hitherto taken as jokes, are really clues—clues to the identity of Martin himself? It is at least worth while following them out and seeing whither they lead us.

Assuming then that things are what they seem—that Martin Marprelate is one man, and Martin Junior and Senior two others, that the first has somehow disappeared, and that the others are attempting to carry on the campaign against the bishops with the help of such fragments as he had left behind—we have next to enquire how Martin Marprelate's 'unperfite papers' came into his 'sons' hands, and why, having kept silence for four months, he himself seems incapable of providing any more copy for the press. But we must walk warily. Here, for example, is a pitfall into which we might grievously stumble had we not fortunately the evidence of the captured printers to warn us off. 'If you demand of me,' writes Martin Junior, 'where I found this [*i.e.*, the manuscript of the theses], the truth is, it was taken up (together with other papers) besides a bush, where it had dropped from somebody passing by that way.'² This pretty little mystery is cleared up for us by John Hodgkins, the printer, in his examination after the arrest. Having related how he went by appointment to Throckmorton's house at Hasely, where he met Penry, he continues, 'The next morning,

¹ Pierce, 'The Marprelate Tracts,' p. 289. ² 'Tracts,' p. 324.

taking leave of the said Throckmorton, Mr. Penry would needs bring him on his way; where, as they were walking towards Warwick, they found in the path, within a bolt-shot of the house, a great part of the said theses, which the said Hodgkins took up and printed.¹ This is one of the characteristic Martinist tricks. The paper had, of course, been carefully put there first by Penry, who then led Hodgkins to the spot. The point was that the latter, if caught, could lie with a clear conscience. He could deny that he had received the paper at the hands of any man, and thus his employers' names could be kept out of the business. But printer and employers had reckoned without the rack, and it is to the rack that we owe the above confession. The 'sons of Martin,' therefore, like boys on a paper-chase, were laying a false trail for the pursuivants of the archbishop, when they placed these papers 'besides a bush' in the path to Warwick, and it is idle for us to follow it up. The tracts 'Martin Junior' and 'Martin Senior,' however, are full of other clues which have a more promising appearance.

Both tracts are addressed as much to Martin himself as to the general public. They repeatedly complain that Martin's sons 'cannot hear from their father,' that 'he hath been tongue-tied these four or five months,' that they do not know where he is, that 'he keepeth himself secret from his sons,' that they are even 'ignorant if he be living or dead.'² Martin Marprelate has vanished off

¹ Pierce, 'Historical Introductions,' p. 333.

² 'Tracts,' pp. 322, 323, 361, etc.

the face of the earth, and his associates, burning to carry on the campaign against the bishops which he had set on foot, are appealing to their lost master to show himself once more to the people. They are not, however, without definite fears as to what may have happened to him. Martin Junior exhorts his father, if he 'have escaped out of the danger of gunshot,' to 'begin again to play the man'; he declares that some 'give out that in the service of his country and her Majesty's he died or was in great danger at the Groine'; and Martin Senior, upbraiding his brother for publishing the theses, asks him, 'If my father should be hurt either at the Groine or at the suburbs of Lisbon, is this the way either to cure him or to comfort him?'¹ Besides these there are several other references to the expedition to Portugal, and the writers are constantly harping upon the haunting suspicion that Martin Marprelate has been slain in battle.² The expedition in question, as we shall presently see, sailed from Plymouth on 18th April, and returned to England on 1st July. If Martin took part in it, we can well understand why he remained 'tongue-tied for four or five months,' or in other words, why no Marprelate tracts appeared between 23rd March and 22nd July. But how could the 'unperfite papers' have reached the hands of the young Martins, when they could hear nothing of their father? The fleet arrives on 1st July. Hodgkins goes to Throckmorton's house about 15th July. 'Martin Junior,' which contains the fragmentary

¹ 'Tracts,' pp. 323, 351.

² *Ibid.* pp. 359, 380, *et passim*.

theses, appears on 22nd July. The irresistible conclusion is that Martin had either come with the fleet, and was now in hiding, or had sent his papers by some messenger, with orders that they should be conveyed to Penry. The papers certainly came over sea. Martin Junior as good as tells us so in the following remarkable passage: 'It would have pitied your heart to see how the poor papers were rain and weather beaten, even truly in such a sort as they could scant be read to be printed. There was never a dry thread in them. These sea-journeys are pitiful I perceive.'¹ Martin Senior also refers to his father's 'scrabbled and weather-beaten papers,' while the writer who was responsible for the second part of 'The Protestation' concludes his account of 'The Epistle' to 'More worke,' which was captured with the printers, as follows: 'with these and such like points, with an honourable mention of all noble soldiers, a complaint of the loss of my papers, and the misery of sea-journeys, I ended my 'Pistle, being the first tome of "More worke for the Cooper."'²

The reference to 'noble soldiers' leads us into the last passage from the tracts which need be considered at this juncture. It is to my mind the most important clue of all, though at first it seemed to me quite incomprehensible. Martin Senior, in the course of a disquisition upon the lordly retinue of the archbishop, which as he states comprised 'seven score horse,' says to his brother Martin

¹ 'Tracts,' p. 334.

² *Ibid.* p. 416.

Junior, 'It may be thou wilt say thy father is every day in the week able to make as many men of his own charges; I would he were not'; and then, as if he feared he had said too much, he hastily adds, 'If he be, it is more than I know, I promise thee; and I think more than thou canst prove.'¹ If these words mean anything, they imply that Martin Marprelate could command a larger retinue than the archbishop himself, which in itself is an interesting discovery enough. But the most curious point of the passage is to be found in the words: 'I would he were not.' Does Martin Senior regret that his father is a powerful and influential personage? It would be absurd to suppose it. No: the meaning clearly is that Martin's retinue is a regiment or an army—that he is, in short, a superior officer or a general; and Martin Senior, who fears that his father may be slain, is lamenting the fact that Martin's profession as a military leader should oblige him to risk his life and therefore his cause. Martin, we are beginning to see, was a person of some importance; he was no mere common soldier or recruit, but an officer and probably a gentleman.

One more point must be noticed before we leave the Martinist side of the evidence. Waldegrave, it will be remembered, went down to Devonshire at the end of March, just before the fleet left Plymouth. By the middle of May he was already in Rochelle. Did Martin take him there on his way to Portugal? Once again the con-

¹ Pierce, 'Tracts,' p. 361.

clusion seems irresistible. Our plot is certainly beginning to thicken.

II.

It is time that we should consider this Portuguese expedition more closely. 1588, the year which saw the launching of Martin's little fleet of paper boats against the bishops, saw also Philip's armada of unwieldy galleons sailing against a bastard queen and a heretic England; and before the winds of God had scattered the last of the Spanish ships, Drake and Norris were fitting out a counter-armada for the Peninsula. The ostensible object of the expedition was the restoration of Don Antonio to the throne of Portugal. He accompanied the fleet, and it was hoped that the Portuguese would rise in his favour against Philip. A land campaign was, therefore, part of the scheme. About 7,000 troops were embarked for the purpose, and Sir Roger Williams, the best English soldier of the day, was appointed third in command after Drake and Norris, with the understanding that he would take charge of the military operations. Elizabeth behaved in her usual temporising and niggardly fashion; the supplies of men and provisions were inadequate; the start, originally fixed for 1st February, was put off from week to week. At length, on 18th April, after waiting in Plymouth over a month for a favourable wind, the fleet put out to sea, and within six days reached Corunna (the Groine) on 23rd April, without touching at any

intermediate port. Here the army was landed and an assault was directed against the city. But though the lower town was carried, the upper town remained impregnable, and after an indecisive battle with a relieving Spanish force, the generals on 8th May thought it best to put their men on board again and try their fortune at another point of the coast. Hitherto Sir Roger Williams had taken no part in the expedition. In company with the Earl of Essex, he had sailed separately from England in his ship, the 'Swiftsure,' and about 20th May he joined the fleet, giving out that he had long been searching for it without success. The English now attacked Peniche, from whence they intended to march upon Lisbon. On 23rd May the troops were again landed, Sir Roger Williams taking command. The castle of Peniche was captured, and on 25th May the English arrived before Lisbon. The suburbs were soon in their hands, but, as at Corunna, the fortified city itself remained unassailable, and since the people of the country did not rise to support Don Antonio, as was expected, the invaders were forced reluctantly to put out to sea once again, about 6th June. The expedition, though ending in no such disaster as had met the Spanish Armada in 1588, was as much of a failure. After a little more perfunctory singeing of the King of Spain's beard at Vigo and other places, the fleet set sail for England, which it reached on 1st July.

Waldegrave, as we saw, was in Rochelle before the middle of May. It is therefore impossible for him to have sailed with the main fleet, which

proceeded straight from England to Corunna without a stop. Yet Martin, if we are to believe his sons, took part in the expedition, and Martin, if he had the means, was obviously the right person to convey the printer to the Huguenot city of refuge, where he would be out of reach of Whitgift's long arm. The only ship belonging to the fleet which did not sail direct to Corunna was the 'Swiftsure.' Leaving England about the same time as Drake and Norris, it was more than a month on the high seas before it fell in with them. Why did it not put out with the other ships in the first place? and what was it doing between 18th April and 20th May? To answer these questions, it is necessary to say something of the careers and persons of its two illustrious passengers, Sir Roger Williams and the Earl of Essex.

Born in 1567, the Earl of Essex was a young man of twenty-two at the time of the expedition to Portugal, but he was already the chief favourite of Queen Elizabeth. Leicester, his step-father, introduced the handsome youth to court in 1584, with the intention of making him his successor in the queen's favour. But Essex, while realising his interest in flattering and making love to the ageing Elizabeth, had a full measure of the Elizabethan lust for action and glory. It was natural, therefore, that he should delight in the company of Sir Roger Williams, a man some thirty years his senior, the hero of a dozen sieges and battles, the bravest and most dashing soldier of the day. Williams, too, was a person of quaint and ready wit, of an

amusingly pedantic turn of mind, and withal of sterling honesty of purpose. The son of Thomas Williams of Penrhôs, Monmouthshire, he also no doubt attracted Essex as a Welshman, for the favourite residence of the young nobleman was his house at Llanfey in Pembrokeshire, where in 1583-4 he had spent two of the happiest years of his life.¹ The two men had probably first struck up an acquaintance in the Netherlands, where both served under Leicester in the campaign of 1585-6, and had received knighthood from their commander's hands for conspicuous valour in the field. Leicester indeed could hardly speak too highly of Williams at this time. 'Roger Williams,' he writes to Walsingham, 6th October, 1586, 'is worth his weight in gold, for he is no more valiant than he is wise, and of judgment to govern his doings.'² At the end of 1586 Essex returned to England, but the Welsh knight remained in the field, distinguishing himself especially in the defence of Sluys, until its fall on 30th June, 1587. Hearing of his friend's predicament, Essex had attempted to escape from Court to the Netherlands, but was caught by the Queen's orders and brought back again. Williams, however, was now sent to London by Leicester with the news of the fall of Sluys, and with a letter of special recom-

¹ W. B. Devereux, 'Lives of the Earls of Essex,' i., pp. 171-2. Essex's steward at this time, as Dr. McKerrow has pointed out to me, was another Welshman, Sir Gilly Meyrick, who was, in 1601, hanged for his share in the performance of Shakespeare's 'Richard II.' Anthony Wood states that he was Williams' 'kinsman.'

² 'Dict. Nat. Biog.,' Williams.

commendation. He remained in England, and was next year made master of the horse under Leicester, to whom the command of the troops, mobilised to resist the Spanish invasion, was entrusted. At this time, however, we find Leicester complaining on one occasion that Williams was frequently absenting himself from his duties without leave.¹ When all danger from the Armada was passed, Williams went to the Netherlands once again, in the train of Sir John Norris; but he was only there a month, since Norris arrived about 9th October, and on 10th November despatched Williams to England with a letter to Walsingham.² After this we have no reason for thinking that Williams left London again for several months. The expedition to Portugal was now in preparation, and he received his appointment as third in command. Yet here again there was an apparent neglect of duty. Instead of going down to Plymouth with Drake and Norris to see after the men and the fleet, he remained at the capital, seeing no doubt a good deal of his young friend, Essex.

And then follows the remarkable story of the 'Swiftsure,' a story which no historian has been able properly to explain. Essex was on fire to go to Portugal, but Elizabeth would not hear of it. He was now necessary to her happiness: 'When she is abroad nobody near her but my Lo. of Essex: and at night, my Lord is at cards, or one

¹ 'Dict. of Nat. Biog.,' *op. cit.*

² Bertie, 'Five Generations of a Loyal House,' i., pp. 224-6, 233. The account given in the 'Dict. of Nat. Biog.' of Williams' movements at the end of 1588 and during 1589 is very misleading. There is no mention, for example, of the Portuguese expedition.

game or another with her, that he cometh not to his own lodging till birds' sing in the morning,' as a contemporary letter-writer expresses it.¹ A man of Essex's temper might well grow tired of such a life, and he determined to try once again to escape from his aged Circe. On 3rd April he and Williams made a dash for the fleet, covering on horseback more than two hundred and twenty miles in less than thirty-six hours. When they reached Plymouth the wind was blowing straight into port, but Essex declared 'that he would not stay two hours in Plymouth, howsoever the wind was.' Accordingly the 'Swiftsure,' the ship which had been assigned to Williams, put out to sea, and was lost sight of for the next five weeks! Elizabeth meanwhile was in a fury. Personages of no less importance than Sir Francis Knollys and Lord Huntingdon were sent, one after the other, post-haste to Plymouth, to find out what they could of the truants' whereabouts. They returned with empty hands. Angry letters were sent to Drake and Norris, to which they replied that they were as ignorant and innocent as the rest.² Nothing could be heard of either Williams or Essex; they appeared to have vanished into thin air. Some time afterwards the queen learnt that the 'Swiftsure,' instead of putting right out to sea, as everyone supposed, had turned into Falmouth, where it remained quietly for some ten days, eventually leaving England about the same date as the rest of the fleet, but not coming up with it, as we have seen, until a month later. Still without news of

¹ Devereux, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 195-8.

the missing ship, except that it had been at Falmouth, and supposing that it had found the fleet, Elizabeth, on 4th May, drafted the following extraordinary letter to Drake and Norris:

Trusty and well beloved, we greet you well. Although we doubt not but of yourselves you have so thoroughly weighed the heinousness of the offence lately committed by Roger Williams that you have both discharged him from the place and charge which was appointed him in that army, and committed the same to some other meet person (as we doubt not but you have choice of as sufficient as he is), and that you have also laid punishment upon him according to his desert; yet we would not but you should also know from ourself, by these our special letters, our just wrath and indignation against him, and lay before you his intolerable contempt against ourself, and the authority you have from us, in that he forsook the army, and conveyed away also one of our principal ships from the rest of the fleet. In which points his offence is in so high a degree, that the same deserveth by all laws to be punished by death, which if you have not already done (and whereunto we know your authority as General doth warrant you), then we will and command you that you sequester him from all charge and service, and cause him to be safely kept, so as he slip not away until you shall know our further pleasure therein, as you will answer for the contrary at your perils; for as we have authority to rule, so we look to be obeyed, and to have obedience directly and surely continued unto us, and so look to be answered herein at your hands. Otherwise we will think you unworthy of the authority you have, and that you know not how to use it. In the mean time we have also found it strange, that, before your departing from Plymouth, you should either be so careless, or suffer yourselves so easily to be abused, that any of our ships, much more a principal ship, should be

III.

K

in such manner conveyed away from the rest of the fleet, and afterwards, also being so near as Falmouth (as we understood) should not by your commandment and direction be stayed; a matter which we cannot but remember unto you, and yet we do hope that you are no partakers of the offence which is committed.

And if Essex be now come into the company of the fleet, we straightly charge you that, all dilatory excuse set apart, you do forthwith cause him to be sent hither in safe manner; which if you do not, you shall look to answer for the same to your smart, for these be no childish actions, nor matters wherein you are to deal by cunning of devises, to seek evasions, as the customs of lawyers is; neither will we be so satisfied at your hands. Therefore consider well of your doings herein.¹

It is not certain that this letter was actually despatched. The draft was submitted to Walsingham, who, in his reply to Windibank, the Queen's Secretary, advises that it should not be sent, since Sir Roger Williams was so popular that his arrest would probably lead to a fatal mutiny; but he significantly adds that the letter 'was in as mild terms as could be expected under the circumstances.'² On the face of it, the utmost that could be charged against Williams was the technical offence, no doubt from the military point of view grave enough, that he had 'conveyed away' for a few days one of the ships of the fleet, for neither Elizabeth nor Walsingham knew at this time of the month's desertion. Yet Elizabeth does not hesitate to say that Williams' 'offence is in so high a degree that the same

¹ Devereux, *op. cit.*, pp. 199-201.

² J. S. Corbett. 'Drake and the Tudor Navy,' II., p. 327 n.

deserveth by all the laws to be punished by death,' and Walsingham, hard-headed Walsingham, agrees with her. The historians explain the letter as the outburst of an angry woman slighted by her lover, and no doubt they are partly right; but, in that case, why should the whole weight of the Queen's wrath fall upon Williams? Why, too, did Williams and Essex leave London at that particular moment? It is true that Essex was anxious to fly from Court, but Drake and Norris were probably aware of his intention and would in any case give Williams due warning before they set sail. Now, on April 3rd there was no prospect at all of the fleet's departure; the winds were not only still adverse but blowing a hurricance outside port. Only imminent danger to one of the parties concerned will adequately explain the headlong career of Williams and Essex to Plymouth. In short, I am persuaded that there was something more behind this affair than a quarrel between the favourite and his royal mistress. Curious rumours were afloat. Elizabeth, writes Windibank to Walsingham, was 'strangely informed against' Drake and Norris, whom she evidently suspected of being in complicity with Williams.' And when the 'Swiftsure' joined the other ships on 20th May, the tongues of the fleet discussed their previous absence and whispered of secret doings. We have a contemporary account of the expedition written by one of the officers of the fleet, which states that Essex 'put off in the same wind from Falmouth that we left Plymouth in; where he lay, because he would avoid the importunities of messengers that were

¹ 'State Papers Domestic' (Eliz.), ccxxii., 50.

daily sent for his return, *and some other causes more secret to himself.*¹ Finally, although Essex returned to England about 6th June in obedience to a peremptory letter, and was speedily forgiven, the next thing we hear of Williams is that he is fighting for Henry of Navarre. There is no evidence that he returned to England with the fleet on 1st July, and the presumption is that he took service with Navarre immediately after the Portuguese expedition. On 28th September, Lord Willoughby landed at Dieppe with an English force to assist the French King. This Williams joined, taking part with his usual reckless bravery in the attack on Paris. Willoughby found the utmost difficulty in getting letters conveyed home through the enemy, who now lay right across his line of communication. Williams alone, Willoughby informs Elizabeth, could be trusted to win through in safety, and he was accordingly made the bearer of a letter dated 29th October, in which he himself was specially commended for his services and brave conduct.² He reached England, and under such circumstances, Elizabeth, whatever her grudge against him, could scarcely have received him with anything but graciousness. Possibly Willoughby sent him home in this way on purpose to help him obtain the pardon. Possibly, too, by this time Essex had prevailed upon the Queen to forgive his friend. Williams, however, returned to France, where, except for occasional visits to London, he spent most of his time in harness until his death in 1595.

¹ 'A True Copie of a Discourse,' 1589. Grosart, 'Miscellanea Antiqua Poetica,' III., 68. (The italics are mine.)

² Bertie *op. cit.*, pp. 271 n., 272, 300.

He died a wealthy man, leaving everything to the Earl of Essex, who gave him a sumptuous funeral with military honours at St. Paul's.

The reader will by this time be aware of the direction in which the evidence is taking us. The suggestion is that Martin Marprelate was Sir Roger Williams; that he planned the campaign and wrote the first three tracts while kicking his heels in England between his return from Sluys in June, 1587, and his departure for Portugal in April, 1589; that either actual discovery or the fear of it prompted his extraordinary flight from London; that he took Waldegrave, his printer, on board the 'Swiftsure' at Falmouth and conveyed him out of harm's way to Rochelle, where he himself and Essex may have been detained by ill winds for a week or so; and that finally, learning from Essex that it was not yet safe to return to England in July, he sent his notes, with some half-finished tracts and 'More worke for the Cooper,' by someone in the returning fleet, who conveyed them to Penry's hands. True, Williams never went to the Groine, as Martin Junior and Senior suggested, but in the nature of the case they could not know that fact; they knew nothing except that Martin had sailed to Portugal and had not returned. So far, our argument has been based upon a number of remarkable coincidences. Let us sum these up in the form of a time chart before we proceed:

1587.

30th June.

Fall of Sluys. Williams comes to England.

Field, Penry and others arranging for a violent attack upon the bishops.

134 MARTIN MARPRELATE AND

1588.

May.
Armada leaves Spain.
Williams frequently absents himself
without leave from the army.

c. 10th July.
Armada in the Channel.

29th July.
Battle of Gravelines.

c. 9th October.
Williams goes to Netherlands with
Norris.

10th November.
Williams returns to England.

May.
By this 'The Epistle' and 'Epi-
tome' already taking shape.

29th September.
Marprelate press set up at East
Molesey.

c. 15th October.
'Epistle' published. The press
moved to Fawsley before 1st
November.

c. 29th November.
'The Epitome' published.

1589.

February.
Williams appointed third in com-
mand of Portuguese Expedition,
but remains in London.

3rd April.
Williams and Essex dash to Ply-
mouth.

7th April.
The 'Swiftsure' puts in at Fal-
mouth.

c. 18th April.
The fleet leaves England. About
the same time the 'Swiftsure'
sails away and disappears for a
month.

20th May.
'Swiftsure' joins the fleet.

23rd May.
Assault of Peniche by Williams
and Essex.

25th May.
Attack on Lisbon.

c. 20th February.
'The Minerals' printed.
23rd March.
'Hay any worke' printed. Walde-
grave goes to Devonshire.

c. 18th April.
'Martin' leaves England as an
'honourable soldier.'

c. 10th May.
Penry hears that Waldegrave is in
Rochelle.

During the summer Waldegrave
prints 'Th' Appellation,' 'M.
Some' and 'A Dialogue.'

SHAKESPEARE'S FLUELLEN. 135

1589—*continued.*

c. 6th June.
Essex returns to England.

1st July.
The fleet comes home.

?
Williams joins Navarre's army.

1st August.
Assassination of Henry III.

c. 15th September.
Williams with Henry of Navarre
at Dieppe.

28th September.
English troops land at Dieppe.

25th October.
Attack on Paris.

29th October.
Williams brings Willoughby's letter
to Elizabeth.

c. 1st July.
Martin's papers reach Penry's hands
in 'weather beaten' condition.
'Theses' copied out and 'Martin
Junior' and 'Senior' written.

c. 15th July.
Hodgkins comes to Hasely.

22nd July.
'Martin Junior' printed.

29th July.
'Martin Senior' printed.

14th August.
The press and printers captured at
Manchester.

? September.
Waldegrave comes to Hasely.

15th September—15th October.
About this time the 'Protestation'
written and printed.

? October.
Penry flies to Scotland.

early 1590.
Waldegrave becomes Royal Printer
in Scotland.

As far as dates go, the above table presents only one obstacle to our theory. 'The Protestation,' published by the worthie gentleman Martin Marprelate, was written and printed when Williams was in France. More will be said about this later, but here it is worth noting that 'The Protestation' synchronises with Williams' presence at Dieppe, whence communication with England was easy.

'THE LIBRARY,' Second Series, VIII., 357.

III.

Up to the present we have established, with I think fair certainty, the following points: (1) That Martin was a military officer or general who took part in the expedition of 1589; (2) that Waldegrave left Devonshire for Rochelle about the same time as the fleet sailed for Portugal, and in all probability was taken there in the 'Swiftsure'; (3) that there is some mystery hitherto unexplained attaching to Williams' conduct and Elizabeth's wrath against him; (4) that there is nothing chronologically impossible in the supposition that Williams wrote the first three Marprelate tracts.

Sir Roger Williams, then, is a very *possible* candidate for the authorship; but we have now to ask ourselves whether he was in any sense a *likely* one. Is there anything to indicate that Essex, who was the intimate of Williams, had any special knowledge of the business or was likely to sympathise with it? Do the tracts give us any more clues about the personality of Martin which agree with what we know about Sir Roger? Could the Welsh knight wield the pen as well as the sword? Was he a puritan? Does his known character display any of those whimsical qualities which are strikingly exemplified in the pages of the tracts? These and similar questions demand answers before our theory can claim proper recognition.

That Martin had friends at Court is a commonplace of Marprelate scholarship. The anti-Martinist writers, and especially Pasquil, constantly lamented that great men, who are, of course, unnamed,

SHAKESPEARE'S FLUELLEN. 137

encouraged the puritans in order that they themselves might profit by the further secularisation of church property which would result from the abolition of episcopacy.¹ The chief of these was undoubtedly the Earl of Leicester, to whom all puritans looked for patronage, and in whose house they held secret conclaves.² But Leicester died on 4th September, 1588, just before the appearance of 'The Epistle,' though he probably knew that something was on foot, since it is recorded in the evidence against the Martinists 'that Penry hath said before any of these libels came forth, that a nobleman deceased did encourage him to write bitterly against the bishops and that (if he were discovered) he should not be imprisoned by the commissioners but by some others for a fashion and so shortly after delivered.'³ Essex, who succeeded Leicester as Elizabeth's favourite, succeeded him also as leader of the puritan party at court, and Whitgift in 1589 opposed his election to the Chancellorship of the University of Oxford on the ground that 'he was generally looked upon as a great patron of the puritans.' It is to him that Martin obviously refers in his 'Epistle' when he bids Whitgift 'Remember your brother Haman. Do you think there is never a Mordecai to step to our gracious Esther for preserving the lives of her faithfullest and best subjects, whom you so mortally

¹ McKerrow, 'Nashe,' i., p. 75, l. 11; p. 94, l. 26; p. 102, l. 7; p. 114. *cp.* also the remarkable Story of the Bear (Leicester) told by Nashe himself, pp. 221-6.

² *e.g.*, 'The lecture in my Lord of Leicester's house,' referred to in 'M. Some laid open,' p. 2.

³ Arber, 'Introductory Sketch,' p. 117.

138 MARTIN MARPRELATE AND

hate and bitterly persecute?'¹ Martin Senior, again, in his mock 'oration of the archbishop to the pursuivants,' puts this significant passage into Whitgift's mouth: 'In faith I think they do my lord of Essex great wrong, that say he favours Martin. I do not think he will be so unwise as to favour those who are enemies unto the State. For if he do, her Majesty, I can tell him, will withdraw her gracious favour from him.'² Finally, a close connection between Essex and Martin is suggested by the well-known story which relates that, upon the occasion of the royal proclamation (13th February, 1589) against the printers and 'dispersers' of the tracts, the young earl in the Queen's presence pulled one of them out of his doublet, and, presenting it to her majesty enquired, 'What then is to become of me?'³ And if we turn to Martin's tracts themselves we find him openly boasting of his power and reputation in high circles. 'I have been entertained at the court. . . . I hope these courtiers will one day see the cause tried between me and you,' he writes in 'The Epitome'; and in the same tract he twice speaks of himself as 'the Courtier Martin,' a phrase which he employs again in 'Hay any worke.'⁴ In one place, indeed, he even goes so far as to declare that the bishops are afraid of him. From Cooper's 'Admonition,' one of the replies to the tracts, Martin quotes the sentence, 'Let the libeller and his do what they dare,' upon which he

¹ Pierce, 'Tracts,' p. 69.² *Ibid.*, p. 357.³ Maskell, 'Martin Marprelate,' pp. 123-4.⁴ Pierce, 'Tracts,' pp. 118, 120, 171, 264.

SHAKESPEARE'S FLUELLEN. 139

comments, 'Here I pray thee mark how I have made the bishops to pull in their horns. For whereas in this place they had printed the word *dare*, they bethought themselves, that they had to deal with my Worship, which am favoured at Court, and being afraid of me, they pasted the word *can* upon the word *dare*.'¹ That this was no idle boast the modern reader may see for himself by an examination of the first edition of Cooper's pamphlet. Again, there are many indications in the tract that Martin had a house in London, and was himself a member of the Court. He warns Whitgift that he is nearer him than he is aware of.² He declares that he knows the archbishop, though he knows no great good of him.³ He always speaks of the bishops as if he had observed their personal habits, and knew the court scandals against them. He refers in the 'theses' to a sermon of Bancroft's preached 28th January, 1583, at Paul's Cross, which he must have heard himself, for it was apparently never printed. His tracts are full of references to London people and scenes, more especially river scenes, which is interesting in the light of the fact that Sir Roger Williams had a house on St. Paul's Wharf.⁴

Sir Roger Williams was a Welshman, and a native of Monmouthshire. His birthplace, Penrhôs, lay near Caerleon, and was therefore not far distant from Cefn Brith, Brecknockshire, where John Penry was born in 1559. Even if the young Welsh reformer had no previous acquaintance

¹ Pierce, 'Tracts,' pp. 269-70. ² *Ibid.*, p. 220. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

⁴ Dict. Nat. Biog.: Roger Williams.

with his famous compatriot, Sir Roger Williams, the most prominent Welshman in London and the intimate friend of Essex, who was the leader of the Puritan party at court, would be the first man to whom Penry would naturally turn to for help. It is almost inconceivable that the two Welshmen could have remained personally unacquainted. On the other hand, internal evidence is all in favour of attributing the first three Marprelate tracts to a Monmouthshire man. The quaint and for the most part incomprehensible rigmarole which precedes the signature to 'The Epistle' begins, 'Given at my castle between two Wales . . .', which is a clear reference to Monmouth, the county that lies on the borders of Devon and Wales proper. Throckmorton, moreover, in his 'M. Some laid open,' after indulging in some fooling in Martin's style, breaks off with, 'But I will not blot any more paper with such ware as this; there is enough of it to be had in the West Country if a man could light upon it': a passage which I take to be an indication that Martin came from the west of England. That Martin, was not an Englishman is, to me at least, proved by his contemptuous treatment of the jingoistic utterances of Aylmer's 'Harborowe,' where, as he puts it, 'you shall see the Englishman preferred before other people, only because he feedeth upon . . . plenty of sheep, oxen, kie . . . whereas other nations feed upon roots, raw herbs, oil and grapes.'² The whole passage calls to mind Fluellen and his

¹ 'M. Some laid open,' p. 69.

² Pierce, 'Tracts,' pp. 153-4.

leek. Aylmer also rouses Martin's ire for his attacks upon the French king and the 'foolish Germans.' A Welshman would resent Aylmer's declaration that 'God is English.'¹ A soldier of fortune like Williams, who had fought with or against most of the nationalities of Europe, would heartily despise the narrow insularism of such utterances. But one of the chief indications of Martin's place of origin is the dialect of the tracts. Terms like 'Ise' (I shall), 'chauve' (I have), 'iss' (yes), 'ti' (thy), 'tee' (thee), are frequent. Sometimes one comes across whole sentences in dialect, such as 'thou hast a right seasoned wainscote face of ti nowne, chwarrnt tee, ti vorehead zaze hard as horne.'² All this is West English, very much as it is still spoken in Monmouth and Somerset to-day. Mr. Pierce describes it as 'conventional,' and contends that Martin took it from such books as 'Gammer Gurton's Needle.'³ To my mind, Martin's use of it is too frequent and assured for it to have been a mere literary trick, and I prefer to think that he borrowed it from the peasants of his native district. Among a number of curious expressions in the first three tracts occurs the word 'umbertie,' which, as Mr. Pierce himself points out, is allied to the Welsh word 'umberth' (a multitude). Finally, Martin constantly fails, intentionally or involuntarily, to distinguish in his orthography between the consonants 'f' and 'v,' which again points to the Welshman, who would naturally pronounce an English 'f' as

¹ 'Harborowe,' 1559, sig. P. 4. v.

² 'Tracts,' p. 272.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 257 note.

'v'; and it is interesting to notice that Martin Junior and Senior, though otherwise avoiding dialectal forms, nearly always refer to Martin Marprelate as their 'Vather,' as if it were a term of endearment. This is only to touch the fringe of of an important theme. The dialect of Martin, and indeed of Elizabethan literature generally, is a subject that badly needs investigation.

Of Sir Roger Williams' Puritan sympathies there can be no doubt. His intimacy with Essex, his hatred of Spain, the long campaigns in the Netherlands, where he would come across not only the Dutch Calvinists, but also the most extreme of the English reformers who took refuge at Middleburgh and other places, all indicate the probability of a pronounced Puritan bias. But the Puritanism of such a man, a dweller in camps, a lover of the good things of life (he died of a surfeit),¹ would scarcely be of the same complexion as that of Cartwright and the preachers. Now Martin, though hating the bishops with the best of them, was very far from being a precisian. His frequent references to card-playing show that he was thoroughly conversant with the various games of the day. The Bishop of Chester, he tells us, is a great card-player, yet he upbraids him, not for that, but because he makes 'trade thereof.' Indeed, he admits that 'in winter it is no great matter to take a little sport, for an odd cast, braces of twenty nobles, when the weather is foul that men cannot

¹ In Welsh the letter *f* represents the consonantal *v* sound, while the *f* sound is written *ff* or *ph*.

² Devereux, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

go abroad to bowls or to shoot. What, would you have men take no recreation?'¹ No rigid Puritan would have penned this striking passage, which condones not merely card-playing for money, but bowls and other recreations which were hardly less obnoxious in Puritan eyes. Moreover, the mention of such sports, and the light reference to heavy stakes like 'braces of twenty nobles,' stamps the sentence as the utterance of a man of means and a courtier. Martin indeed has evidently very little respect for the ordinary Puritans, 'our precise brethren,'² as he calls them, with a slight curl of the lip. He realises to the full their lack of humour ('I am sure their noses can abide no jest'³), for he himself suffers by it. 'The Puritans are angry with me, I mean the Puritan preachers. And why? Because I am too open, because I jest'; and again, 'I am favoured of all estates, the Puritans only excepted.'⁴ This is the burden of all his tracts. In places he seems to hint that the Puritans are intriguing against him. 'This is the Puritans' craft in procuring me to be confuted, I know. I'll be even with them too.'⁵ 'I know I am disliked . . . of many which you call Puritans. It is their weakness I am threatened to be hanged by you.'⁶ But the most remarkable passage of all is that in which he threatens Cartwright himself, the leader of the Puritan movement. Cooper's 'Admonition' appeared with the letters T. C. upon the title-page, and Martin is evidently not quite sure whom these letters signify. He takes them,

¹ 'Tracts', p. 218.² *Ibid.*, p. 123.³ *Ibid.*, p. 125.⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 118.⁵ p. 215.⁶ p. 245.

and rightly, to stand for Thomas Cooper, but they might — uncomfortable thought! — equally well refer to Thomas Cartwright. Martin is determined to face even that eventuality, 'Thomas Cartwright, shall I say that thou madest this book against me, because T. C. is set to it? Well, take heed of it! If I find it to be thy doing, I will besoop thee, as thou never bandedst John Whitgift in thy life.'¹ This contempt for the precisian, and freedom from his narrow prejudices, this suspicion that the preachers are not acting honestly by him, this ignorance of their spirit and tendencies which allows him to think for one moment that Cartwright could have penned Cooper's 'Admonition,' and finally this bold threat to treat the chief Puritan minister of the land in the same manner as he had treated the bishops, are proofs that Martin, earnest man and sound anti-episcopalian as he was, could have been no ordinary Puritan — that, on the contrary, he stood outside the Puritan camp, firing his lonely gun at the foe, but careless or contemptuous what his allies thought of him.

Sir Roger Williams was not only a brave soldier, but also a man of considerable learning and wide reading. Indeed, his quaint pedantry was almost as attractive to his admirers as his courage. He was educated at Brasenose College, Oxford.² Martin, too, it seems, was an Oxford man,³ who had a special grudge against one Dr. Prime, a Fellow of New College, to whom he gives the curious nickname 'Wynkyn

¹ 'Tracts,' p. 266.

² Dict. Nat. Biog., *op. cit.*

³ This is proved by his constant reference to Oxford teachers and Oxford text books; cf. 'Tracts,' pp. 34, 267, 282.

de Worde.' Among his 'unperfite papers' was a Latin satire upon this man,¹ and there are many other indications that Martin was a good Latin scholar. His knowledge of history, especially of Roman history,² is extensive, and his boast, 'I have read something in my days,'³ is no idle one. Nor has he neglected the literature of England. He refers to the 'Wife of Bath,' and he mentions 'Gammer Gurton's Needle' no less than three times.⁴ At the same time, his theological attainments, though quite adequate to his purpose, are nothing remarkable in an age when everyone was his own theologian as he was his own lawyer. As a soldier Sir Roger's main interest was naturally military tactics, and he has left us two books on this subject: 'The Actions of the Lowe Countries,' first published in 1618, dealing with his campaigns in the Netherlands, which is described by Motley as 'one of the most valuable and attractive histories of the age'; and 'A briefe discourse of Warre,' 1590, which is chiefly concerned with military discipline and tactical theory. The relation between the style of these treatises and that of Martin will be considered later; it is sufficient here to notice that with Sir Roger Williams the pen was almost as mighty as the sword. 'A briefe Discourse,' moreover, contains a clue which, taken in conjunction with those already brought forward, is of great importance. It will be recollected that Martin's papers had arrived in England at the beginning of July, 1589, in an imperfect condition, and that the

¹ 'Tracts,' p. 363.² *Ibid.*, p. 249.³ *Ibid.*, p. 27.⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 282, 33, 140, 167.

146 MARTIN MARPRELATE AND

writer of the epistle to 'More worke' had complained of the misery of sea-journeys and the loss of his papers. The said loss cannot refer to the seizure of the manuscript with the printers in August, because it was spoken of in the manuscript which was itself seized—*i.e.*, the epistle to 'More worke.' In the light of this, it is extraordinarily interesting to find Sir Roger Williams telling Essex, in the dedication of his book published 1590 (the very next year), that he had busied himself for more than two years 'in writing sundrie actions that passed in our daies,' which he would have published had he not 'unfortunately lost part of his papers through the negligence of a servant.' By itself, the point might be dismissed as a mere coincidence. But in an argument like the present, which rests entirely upon circumstantial evidence, once a certain number of coincidences have been adduced, every fresh one becomes a strong link in the chain of proof. Martin's papers had been carelessly handled, as we have seen, for they were drenched with sea-water. It appears now that their 'unperfite' condition was also due to the 'negligence' of the servant into whose hands they were entrusted, together with the rest of Sir Roger Williams' manuscripts.

IV.

It remains to round off this side of the argument with a few remarks upon Williams' personality. He is one of the great 'characters' of Elizabethan England. Every historian who has come across him lingers lovingly over his eccentricities. Motley

SHAKESPEARE'S FLUELLEN. 147

calls him 'the mad Welshman,' and again, 'that doughty Welshman . . . truculent and caustic, ready with sword and pen, foremost in every mad adventure or every forlorn hope'; he speaks of his 'experienced eye and keen biting humour,' of his sharp sensible tongue, and his frank open heart; he pictures him with 'his shrewd Welsh head under his iron morion, and a stout Welsh heart under his tawny doublet.' Mr. Corbett, the greatest authority on Elizabethan seamanship, describes Williams as 'one of the most distinguished soldiers of his time,' and again as 'the renowned Welsh captain with his professional pedantry, his quaint and forcible turns of speech, his vanity and cool valour.' Sir Sidney Lee, in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' mentions his choleric temper and bluntness of speech, his conspicuous valour and daring, and in reference to the wars in France under Navarre, speaks of him as 'prominent in many skirmishes, squabbling as of old with his commanders, challenging the enemy to single combat, and writing to the Queen, with almost insolent frankness, of the niggardly support she was affording to the foreign allies.' Martin Hume also writes to much the same effect. But the figure of the man stands out clearest of all in the old story told of him and printed in the Camden Society's 'Anecdotes and Traditions.'¹ It runs as follows: 'Sir Roger Williams (who was a Welchman, and but a taylour at the first, though afterwards a very brave souldier) being gracious with Queen Elizabeth, prefer'd a suite to her, which she

¹ p. 47, 1839, ed. W. J. Thoms.

thought not fitt to grant; but he, impasient of a repulse, resolv'd to give another assault; so coming one day to court, makes his address to the Queene, and watching his time, when she was free and pleasaunt, beganne to move againe; she perceived it at the instant, and observing a new payre of boots on his leggs, clapps her hand to her nose and cries, "Fah, Williams, I prythee, begone, thy bootes stinke." "Tut, Tut, madame," sayes he, "'tis my sute that stinkes."

A little picture like this of the Elizabethan Court is worth volumes of history. Small wonder, indeed, that the Marprelate business was hushed up if Williams, who could address the Queen in such familiar terms, was the author of the tracts. But this man lives, as he deserves, in other pages than those of history. All the historians have noticed his resemblance to that 'marvellous Welshman,' Fluellen. It would be strange if they had not. Fluellen's choler, his bluntness, his ready wit, his vanity, his pedantry, his sturdy love of his native land, his cool and dashing bravery, his contempt for everyone's opinion but his own upon the subject of 'the disciplines of wars,' are all Williams' characteristics. When Fluellen tells Henry V., 'I am your majesty's countryman, I care not who knows it; I will confess it to all the 'orld; I need not to be ashamed of your majesty, praised be God, so long as your majesty is an honest man,' we hear the voice of the Monmouthshire knight addressing his liege lady Elizabeth Tudor. When Pistol reminds Fluellen that the Duke of Exeter loves him well, and Fluellen replies,

'Ay, I praise God; and I have merited some love at his hands,' we at once think of the intimacy between Williams and Essex. The parallel, in short, is far too close to have been accidental. Shakspeare knew Southampton, and probably his friend Essex; and even if he never met Sir Roger he must, like everyone else in London, have heard stories of the extraordinary Welsh knight. Moreover, when he set out in 1599 to write his great epic drama of England in arms, could he have chosen a more appropriate figure to strut upon the front of his stage than one who was at once the bravest and most popular of Elizabeth's officers and the most eccentric of Elizabeth's courtiers? Shakspeare never invented when the stuff lay ready to his hand. His age had produced a magnificent fighting man who was also a great comic figure. He put him, just as he was, into his play, and the world has marvelled ever since at the finest comic soldier in all literature. The choleric knight himself, it should be noted, could take no umbrage at the dramatist's action, for he had been in his grave some four years when 'Henry V.' was first played within the 'wooden O' of the Globe Theatre.

The personality of Fluellen-Williams is exactly that which one might have expected the author of the Marprelate tracts to possess. Whimsical and blunt; intensely serious, yet boisterous and vivacious; impatient of the slightest contradiction; ready to pick a quarrel with any man who irritates him, even if he be of his own party; overflowing with originality, with wit, with arrogance and

with personal vanity; and yet at the same time all the more attractive, even lovable, for the very foibles of his character—such is the Martin we find in the tracts, as those who know them well can testify. They can testify also to the presence, behind this eccentric exterior, of a man of lofty purpose, of absolute fearlessness, of more than usual energy. Monmouth did not and could not produce three such men to add to the gaiety of Elizabethan England. Martin, Williams, and Fluellen are one man, and I venture to assert that the compound makes one of the most astonishing personalities of that astonishing period. Shakespeare was not the only poet who looked with admiration upon the Welshman. Williams' compatriot, John Davies of Hereford, has celebrated him by name in his 'Microcosmos,' 1603, and we cannot do better than close this estimate of his character with two quotations from this poem:

Now from the Court, descend we to the campe,
 And from those elder times, to these of ours:
 There find we (no less currant for the stampe)
Williams (world's wonder for his native powers)
 Out daring Death in many sanguine shoures:
 The singing Bullets made his soule rejoyce
 As Musicke that the hearing most alures,
 And if the cannons bas'd it with their voice,
 He seem'd as ravisht with a Heav'nly noise.
 And when the Fomens muskets spight did spitt
 Then would he spitt in sport at them the while:
 The Blowes his courage gave were plac'd by witt,
 For Witt and Courage dwelt still in his stile:
 While Cowardice and Folly made them vile

Whose glory lay all in their Ladies' lappe,
 And when he came to Court, at them would smile,
 Yea, smoothlie jest at their soft-silken Happe,
 Yet could, like Mars, take there sometimes a napp.

.

Should I recount the pettie Miracles
 By him performéd, in his marshall course,
 My words would scarce be held for Oracles:
 Suffizeth me the World (that knew his force)
 Well knew his Hart was Witt and Valour's source,
 And they that most envy our Brittish Fame
 Must needs thus much of him confesse (perforce)
 That whatsoever from this Brittain came
 Was Witt and spright, or favor'd of the same.

'Wit and courage dwelt still in his style,' 'His
 heart was wit and valour's source,' 'That what-
 soever from this Briton came was wit or sprite':
 what more appropriate phrases could be found for
 the Welsh soldier-pedant who wrote the Marprelate
 tracts?

J. DOVER WILSON.

(To be concluded.)

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE.

THE 'Sermon on Source-Hunting' recently delivered by Professor Neil Dodge¹ contains much sound doctrine and judicious observation. But in the examples which he employs to enforce his lesson he is not always fortunate. It is my present purpose to consider in detail the first of the cases of misguided source-hunting to which he directs attention—namely, the description of the horse in 'Venus and Adonis.' Professor Dodge reprints—italics and all—the parallel which has recently been pointed out by Sir Sidney Lee² between Shakespeare's lines and the description of Cain's horse in Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas. But though the array of italicised phrases, as Professor Dodge concedes, is impressive, he warns the reader against hastily assuming that Sylvester—or rather his French original—was the 'source' used by Shakespeare. For one may find 'a very similar description of a horse in Pulci's "*Morgante Maggiore*" (canto xv., stanzas 105-7).' 'Did Du Bartas,' he inquires, 'here imitate Pulci? Was it Pulci or Du Bartas that Shakespeare imitated, or was it both?'

¹ 'Modern Philol.' (October, 1911), ix., 211 ff.

² 'The French Renaissance in England,' 1910, p. 337 note.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 153

So far as the Du Bartas-Shakespeare parallel is concerned, Professor Dodge might have increased the force of his objections by noting that some of the striking points of resemblance which appear in Sylvester's translation are lacking in the French original, though, as the translation is later than 'Venus and Adonis,' the French text alone would have been accessible to Shakespeare. For example, the horse's mane in Du Bartas is not 'thin,' as it is in Sylvester and Shakespeare. Nor does Sylvester's phrase 'fat buttocks' (italicised by Sir Sidney) find its counterpart in the French text.

In reply to Professor Dodge's rhetorical question, then, we may agree at once that the description of the horse in 'Venus and Adonis' is not derived from Du Bartas or from Du Bartas *plus* Pulci. But are the similarities between the three descriptions adequately accounted for by the statement with which Professor Dodge concludes his discussion?

. . . all three descriptions are but poetic records of the various 'good points' then recognized by connoisseurs in horseflesh. These would of course vary, according to locality and time, even as the three descriptions vary, but it would be odd if the ideal English steed of the end of the sixteenth century were another beast than the ideal French steed of the same era, or even than the ideal Italian steed of a hundred years earlier; and that Shakespeare, who knew most of what was practically worth knowing in his day, from the prejudices of the rural gentry to the ways of London inn-keepers, should need a foreign poet to teach him the points of a good horse is surely improbable.

Though this statement is not entirely explicit, it seems to imply that these poets—or Shakespeare at least—described the horse without reference to authorities, drawing merely upon their observation and the stock of common knowledge in their day. But in ignoring the existence of a more or less definite literary tradition concerning the points of the horse, it is distinctly misleading. For even after the theory of direct dependence is eliminated, the possibility still remains that these poets were following earlier models. Indeed, without this hypothesis it is difficult to explain the points of agreement which one notes in these three descriptions—as well as in others which will be mentioned presently. In other words, Professor Dodge has not solved the problem confronting the student of Shakespeare, but has merely added to its complications. Accordingly, his sermon becomes an *incentive to more source-hunting*. Drive out the source-hunter with a fork, and he still comes running back!

Another description of the horse to which Mr. C. K. Pooler, in his edition of 'Venus and Adonis,'¹ has just called attention, is found in Edward Topsel's 'Historie of Foure-Footed Beastes' (London, 1607). As Mr. Pooler remarks in his note on Shakespeare's lines, 'Of these fourteen points, Topsel in his several descriptions of the colt, horse, and stallion explicitly names ten.' Again, in the same year in which Topsel's book appeared, Gervase Markham published a treatise on horsemanship, 'Cavelarice,' which contains a somewhat

¹ 'Shakespeare's Poems,' Arden Shakespeare, London, 1911.

similar list of the points of the good horse. As this has never been referred to in connection with Shakespeare's description, I quote the passage (with some abridgements):

His head should be somewhat long, leane, and large . . . ; his eare if it be short and sharpe, it is best, but if it bee long and vpright, it is a signe of speede and good mettall. His foreheade long and rysing in the middest . . . ; his eyes full and rounde; his nostrils wyde, and without rawnesse, his mouth large and hairie; . . . his crest strong and well rysen; his necke straight, firme, and as it were of one peece with his bodie; . . . a broad strong brest, a short chyne, an out-ribbe, a well-hidden bellie, shorte and well-knitte iöyntes, flat legges, exceeding shorte, straight and vpright pasternes, which is a member above all other to be noted: his hoofes bothe blacke and strong, yet long and narrow; and for his maine and taile, the thinner the more spirit, the thicker the greater sign of dullnesse.¹

Markham's preference for the thin mane is an interesting point of agreement with the 'Venus and Adonis' against the thick mane of Topsel's lists. Nevertheless, Markham's catalogue on the whole cannot be said to be closer to Shakespeare than are those of Topsel.

Markham and Topsel, like Sylvester, are too late, of course, to have influenced Shakespeare. Yet as we compare their lists in detail, we begin to suspect that we are dealing with a more or less stereotyped catalogue of the points of the horse, whose sources lie farther back. Topsel, indeed, gives us a valuable clue to the sources of his

¹ Book III., cap. 2, ed. 1607, pp. 13-14.

156 SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE.

material by his repeated references to classical writers.¹

As a preliminary to the study of the descriptions by writers of the sixteenth century, it becomes necessary, therefore, to examine briefly the points of the good horse as they are set forth by classical authors. These have been conveniently assembled by Professor M. H. Morgan,² in his translation of Xenophon's *Περὶ Ἱππικῆς*. By way of commentary upon Xenophon's discussion of the shape which a horse should have (chap. I., pp. 14-18), he presents in translation passages on the same subject from ten Greek and Roman authors (pp. 107-117)—namely:

Simon the Athenian (? beginning of the fourth cent. B.C.).

Varro, 'Rerum Rusticum,' Lib. III. (37 B.C.).

Vergil, 'Georgics' (about 29 B.C.), Lib. III., vv. 72 ff.

Calpurnius Siculus, 'Eclogues' (betw. 57 and 60 A.D.), VI., vv. 52, ff.

Columella, 'De Re Rustica' (a little before 65 A.D.), Lib. VI., cap. xxix.: 'De indole et forma equi.'

Oppian, 'De Venatione' (first part of third cent.), Lib. I., vv. 173-193.

Nemesian, 'Cynegeticon' (second half of third cent.), Lib. I. (Ed. 1533, fol. 18^b).

¹ For example, Plato, Varro, Vergil and Palladius. The passage which he quotes as from Varro, however, really belongs to Columella. This and other slips make me doubt strongly whether Topsell in most instances quoted at first hand.

² 'The Art of Horsemanship,' Boston, 1893.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 157

Aspyrtus (veterinary surgeon under Constantine the Great), in 'Geoponica,' XVI., i. 9 ff.

Pelagonius, 'Ars Veterinaria' (last half of fourth cent.), Ed. Ihm, Leipzig, 1892, p. 33.

Palladius, 'De Re Rustica' (about 350 A.D.), Lib. IV., Tit. 13.

To this list should be added two other similar passages, mentioned by Professor Morgan, but not printed by him:

Julius Pollux the Grammarian, 'Onomasticon' (second cent.), cap. xi., § 5, 'De corpore et ingenio equi boni et mali.' The Greek text of the 'Onomasticon' was printed in 1502; the Latin text was first printed at Basel in 1541.

Isidore of Seville, 'Origines' (Lib. XII., cap. i., 'De pecoribus et iumentis').

For our present purpose it is not necessary to reprint these texts, most of which are easily accessible, nor to compare them in detail. Some observations as to their relationships, however, may be of interest.

Of all the descriptions of the horse in the foregoing list none, perhaps, was more important than that of Columella (which was itself a combination of the account by Varro with that of Vergil). Columella's description was followed directly (with slight verbal changes) by the two writers on veterinary science, Aspyrtus and Pelagonius. Palladius likewise based his account directly upon Columella's, though he used his source with greater freedom. One change introduced by Palladius is of such importance for our purpose that it must be noted—namely, the change from 'oculi nigri' to 'oculi magni.'

158 SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE.

Palladius's treatise was translated during the Middle Ages into several languages, among them being English.¹ Moreover, Palladius's description of the horse was incorporated by Isidore in his cyclopædic treatise on 'Origins.' And through Isidore the influence of Palladius was probably even greater than at first hand.² Directly based on Isidore's text is the metrical description of the horse in Lawrence of Durham's 'Dialogi,'³ as well as the prose account by Albertus Magnus in the 22nd Book of his treatise, 'De Animalibus.'⁴ And, finally, a literal translation of the passage in the 'Origines' was included in that famous compilation, 'Batman uppon Bartholome'⁵:

And heereto Isidore saith, that old men meane, that in gentle horses, noble men take heede of foure things: of shape & of fairnesse, of wilfulnesse and of colour. Of shape, that he be strong and sadde of body, and according to strength & might and height, and length, and breadth, that the side be long, and some deale small, that the loynes be great, and the thighs round and large, and broad breasted, and all the body full sad, and full of brawne, and the foote drye, and hoofe hollow and sad. Fairnesse is knowen by lytle head, and the skinne cleauing nigh to y^e bone, if

¹ 'Palladius on Husbondrie,' ed. E. E. T. S. from a manuscript of about 1420.

² Certain slight alterations by Isidore enable us to distinguish the influence of his account in subsequent writers. Thus Pall., 'vastum corpus,' Isidore, 'validum corpus'; Pall., 'aures breues et argutae,' Isidore, 'aures breues et acutae'; Pall., 'coma et cauda profusior,' Isidore, 'coma densa et cauda.' Isidore also inserts a new item, 'erecta ceruix.'

³ Vv. 195-216, ed. Surtees Soc., vol. lxx., p. 21.

⁴ Ed. Venice, 1494, fol. 216^b.

⁵ London, 1582, Lib. XVIII., Of Equo, chap. 39.

the cares be little and sharpe, if the eyen be great and the nosethrills large, if he beareth up the head, if the maane be thicke, and the taylor long, and if the hooft be well pight and round. The wilfulnesse is knowen, if he be bold of hart, and swifte of feete, if y^e members quake: it is token of strength, and if he be soone areared, and riseth soone from great rest: or els, if he be soone stinted in swifte course and running. The colour is knowen, for the coulour in them, is nowe red, nowe blacke, nowe white, and nowe graye, and nowe diuers, and nowe speckeled. The diuers colour beautifieth much or disfigureth an horse, and is a token to know strength and will of a horse: but to pursue by order, and to make processe orderly, it were long. *Huc vsque Isidorus libro. 12.*

To return to the classical writers in Professor Morgan's list, the description of the horse by Oppian seems to show a perceptible reminiscence of the 'Georgics.' Nor were Oppian's lines altogether without influence upon later writers. In the 'Historia de Vi et Natura Animalium,' compiled by Peter Gilles and published at Lyons in 1533, the chapter on the horse (Lib. IV., cap. i.), though it bears the heading 'Gillii Accessio,' is really only a prose paraphrase of Oppian.¹

The Greek authors cited by Professor Morgan affected the West for the most part, through the medium of Latin literature. But with the revival of Greek learning instances of direct influence appear. A striking instance of this is found in Conrad Heresbach's 'Rei Rusticae Libri IV.'

¹ It may be worth while noting that Oppian was the first to bring into his description of the horse a comparison to the deer—a point in which he is followed by Gilles, of course, and also by Grisone, Cardano and Du Bartas.

(Cologne, 1570), in which the larger part of the discussion of the points of the horse (fol. 204^b-206) is borrowed directly from Xenophon. From Germany Heresbach's treatise passed to England, where it was translated by Barnabe Googe, and printed in 1577 under the title 'Foure Bookes of Husbandry.'¹ The passage with which we are concerned is on fol. 115 (wrongly printed '113'). In this way Xenophon's description became readily accessible to any Elizabethan writer on the horse. As the result of this brief survey, therefore, one perceives, not only that a coherent body of tradition as to the points of the horse existed in classical literature, but also that in repeated instances this tradition reappears without essential variation in treatises of the sixteenth century.

Having recognised in classical tradition the ultimate sources of the Elizabethan descriptions of the horse, we must take account also of the important contribution which was made by writers of the Middle Ages. For it must not be supposed that all of them were content, like the cyclopædists, to transmit the earlier lists of points without modification. Among mediæval writers on the horse the place of chief importance seems to belong to Jordanus Ruffus de Calabria, veterinary surgeon of the Emperor Frederick II., whose treatise on veterinary science was the earliest in a long line of similar works composed by Italian veterinarians

¹ Some traces of the influence of Pollux's 'Onomasticon' are also to be noted. Thus cf. the description of the eyes, 'Oculi magni, sanguinei atque igneum tuentes prominentesque,' with the phrase of the 'Onomasticon,' 'oculi ignei sanguineum tuentes.'

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 161

from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century.' In the second half of the thirteenth century Ruffo's list of the points of the horse was copied, with trifling alterations, by Petrus de Crescentiis, in his 'Opus Ruralium Commodorum.' I quote the description of the horse from this treatise rather than from Ruffo's, since the Latin text of the latter is not accessible :

De cognitione pulchritudinis equorum.

Equus pulcher corpus habet formosum magnum et longum, et sue magnitudini proportionaliter omnia membra respondent. Caput eius sit gracile siccum et conuenienter longum. Os magnum et laceratum habeat, nares inflatas et magnas, oculos grossos vel non occultos. Auriculas paruas et aspidas deferat. Collum habeat longum et gracile versus caput. Crines paucos et planos. Pectus grossum et quasi rotundum. Dorsum curtum et quasi planum. Lumbos rotundos et grossos. Costas grossas vt bouinas. Ventrem longum. Anchās longas et tensas. Clunem longum et amplum. Caudam habeat longam cum paucis et planis crinibus. Copras latas et bene carnosas. Garecta satis ampla et sicca. Falces habeat curuas vt ceruus. Crura bene ampla et et pilosa. Iuncturas crurium grossas et curtas vt bos. Vngulas pedum amplas duras et concauas prout decet. Sit equus altior aliquantulum in parte posteriori quam in anteriori

¹ Ruffus wrote in Latin, but his book was afterwards translated into the vernacular, under the title 'Libro dell' Arte de Marascaldi,' of which the first edition was printed at Venice in 1492. In the edition of 1554 the description of the horse (cap. iii.) stands on fol. 7^{vo}. A full list of mediæval Italian treatises upon the horse, with bibliographical details, will be found in Luigi Barbieri's edition of L. Rusio's 'La Mascalcia,' vol. ii., Bologna, 1867.

III.

M

vt ceruus. Collum deferat eleuatum et sit in eo grossicies iuxta pectus.¹

The phrase 'crines paucos'—the prototype of the 'thin mane' in 'Venus and Adonis'—should be specially noted. Petrus in this particular is closely following Ruffo, and both of them stand in direct opposition to classical tradition. Before the close of the thirteenth century Ruffo's description of the horse was again appropriated, this time by Lorenzo Rusio, author of another veterinary treatise. Rusio's method is interesting: he has made a deliberate combination of Palladius and Ruffo. From Palladius is borrowed the chapter, 'Que sunt considerata in parentibus' (cap. iii.) and the first few lines of the succeeding chapter, 'De pulchritudine equorum.' The rest of chapter iv. is taken directly from Ruffo. It is noteworthy that in regard to the mane, Rusio ranges himself with Ruffo against Palladius.²

It is hardly necessary for our present purpose to trace the successive redraftings of Ruffo's list of points which are to be found in the series of veterinary treatises from the beginning of the fourteenth to the sixteenth century. It may be of interest, however, to note an instance of the direct influence of Ruffo outside this special field. Luigi Alamanni's poem, 'La Coltivazione,' is usually spoken of as based directly upon the 'Georgics,'

¹ Lib. IX., ed. Louvain, 1473, fol. 136^b.

² Rusio's words are: 'Comas et caudam cum paucis et longis crinibus' ('Liber Marascalcie Equorum,' ed. 1485, fol. 2^a).

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 163

but the passage¹ describing the horse owes to the classical sources only one or two minor details. It is from Ruffo that nearly the whole of the description has been taken.

Grande il cauallo, & di misura adorna
 Esser tutto deuria quadrato, & lungo;
 Leuato il collo, & doue al petto aggiunge
 Ricco, & formoso, & s'assottiglie in alto;
 Sia breue il capo. & s'assimiglie al serpe;
 Corte l'acute orecchie; & largo & piano
 Sia l'occhio, & lieto, & non intorno cauo;
 Grandi, & gonfiate le fumose nari;
 Sia squarciata la bocca; & raro il crino;
 Doppio, eguale, spianato, & dritto il dorso;
 L'ampia groppa spatiosa; il petto aperto;
 Ben carnose le coscie, & stretto il uentre;
 Sian neruose le gambe, asciutte, & grosse;
 Alta l'unghia, sonante, caua, & dura;
 Corto il tallon; che non si pieghi à terra;
 Sia ritondo il ginocchio; & sia la coda
 Larga, crespa, setosa, & giunta all' anche
 Ne fatica, o, timor la smuoua in alto.²

¹ The horse should be large, handsomely proportioned, compactly built and long; the neck should be raised, and gracefully tapering upward from a generous and shapely breast; let the head be short and resembling a serpent's; the ears short and sharp. Let the eye be large and full and lively, without any hollow surrounding it. Great and swollen the smoking nostrils; the mouth should be well split, and the mane scanty. The back should be double, symmetrical, flat and straight. The ample rump should be large, the breast broad, the thighs well fleshed, and the belly strait. The legs should be sinewy dry and large, and the hoof high, resounding, hollow and hard. The pastern should be short so that it may not bend to the ground. Let the knees be round and the tail be long, curly, bristly and kept close to the haunch so that neither fatigue nor fear should raise it.

² 'La Coltiuatione,' Lib. II., ed. Parigi, 1546, fol. 53^b-4. In striking contrast to Alamanni's lines is the thoroughly classical

More difficult to classify are certain descriptions of the horse by mediæval writers, which either lack such definite characteristics as would enable us to determine their lineage, or else show a confusing mixture of influences. Of this sort is the passage in Pulci's '*Morgante Maggiore*,'¹ to which Professor Dodge has called attention—though it shows closer resemblances, perhaps, to Lorenzo Rusio than to any other. Of this sort also is the picture of the horse in the well-known goliardic poem—of the thirteenth century at the latest—which bears the title, '*Certamen inter Phillidem et Floram*.' The horse which Flora rides is thus described:

*Equus fuit domitus pegaseis loris,
Multum pulchritudinis habet et valoris,
pictus artificio varii coloris;
Nam mixtus nigredini candor est oloris.
Pulchre fuit habilis, etatis primeve,
et respexit paululum munde non seve;
ceruix fuit ardua, sparsa coma leve,
auris parua, prominens pectus, caput breve,
Dorso pando jacuit virgini cessure
Spina que non senserat aliquid pressure;
pede cauo, tibia recta, largo crure.
totus fuit sonipes studium nature.²*

tone of the description of the horse in the fifteenth century Latin poem '*Rusticus*,' by Angelo Politiano (ed. 1512, fol. 7^b). As this description contributes nothing to our present enquiry I have not thought it necessary to quote it.

¹ Canto XV., stanzas 105-7.

² MS. Harl. 978, fol. 95^b-6. The poem has been printed from this manuscript by Thos. Wright, '*Poems of Walter Mapes*,' Camden Soc., pp. 258-67, and from another manuscript, which shows considerable textual variation, by J. A. Schmeller, '*Carmina Burana*,' 1847, p. 161 ff.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 165

One easily notes in these lines the recurrence of phrases which stood in the classical descriptions.¹ From mediæval tradition, on the other hand, comes the thin mane, and also, perhaps, the preference for the colour white. Certainly, to judge from the romances, the favourite colour of the horse in the Middle Ages was white. M. G. Huet,² discussing the lines which have just been quoted, calls attention to a somewhat similar description in the 'Carmen de Prodicione Guenonis,' preserved in a fifteenth century manuscript (Cotton, Titus A. XIX., fol. 153-5):

337—

Si quis equum, quis equi speciem, quis singula laudat?
 Illius ad laudem singula sufficiant:
 Horridus aspectus, auris brevis, ardua ceruix,
 Costaque proluxa, tibia recta sibi,
 Crus perlargum, pes cavus et pectus spaciosum.³

Both these Latin poems, M. Huet endeavours to show, borrowed their descriptions of the horse from the 'Chansons de gestes.' But as he wholly ignores the existence of classical prototypes, his argument is far from conclusive. That they may have been somewhat affected by the romances is, of course, possible, though none of the romances

¹ One recalls at once the 'ardua ceruix' of the 'Georgics.' But a line of Horace is even more to the point: 'quod pulcræ clunes, breve quod caput, ardua ceruix' ('Serm.,' Lib. I., ii., 89).

² 'Romania,' xxii., 538-40.

³ The poem has been printed in full by G. Paris, 'Romania,' XI., 465-518. M. Paris is surely mistaken in regarding this description as taken directly from the 'Chanson de Roland,' vv. 1652 ff.

give such a detailed description of the horse as that in the 'Certamen inter Phillidem et Floram.'¹

A word must be said at this point concerning the 'Amorous Contention of Phillis and Flora,' which Thos. Wright reprints in the Appendix of his volume,² from an old print of 1598. In stating that this poem is the work of 'R. S.,' Wright was deceived by the impudent assertion on the title-page of this edition. In point of fact, the 'Amorous Contention' was stolen outright from George Chapman, who had printed it in 1595 in the same volume with 'Ouid's Banquet of Sence,' under the heading: 'The amorous contention of "Phillis and Flora," translated out of a Latine coppie, written by a Fryer, Anno 1400.'³ It remained for Collier to confuse the matter still further. Noting resemblances between the description of the horse in the 'Amorous Contention' and that in 'Venus and Adonis,' he charges 'R. S.' with modelling these lines directly upon Shakespeare, entirely overlooking the fact that from first to last the 'Amorous Contention' closely translates the mediæval 'Certamen'!

¹ As elaborate as any are the descriptions in 'Gui de Bourgogne' (ed. Guissard et Michelant, Paris, 1859), vv. 2325-9, and in 'La Chanson des Saxons' (ed. F. Michel, 'Romans des Douze Pairs,' 1839, I., 139). For a summarized presentation of the traits of the horse in the romances, see F. Bangert, 'Die Tiere im alt-französischen Epos' (Stengel's Ausgabe und Abhandl., XXXIV.), pp. 48-50.

² 'Poems of Walter Mapes,' pp. 363-70.

³ I am under obligations to Mr. F. Madan for verifying this title from the copy of the 1595 edition of the 'Banquet of Sence' preserved in the Bodleian Library. In the 1875 edition of Chapman's Works this poem will be found at pp. 43-9.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 167

Quite as difficult to classify as the Goliardic poet's description of the horse is that which stands in a late fifteenth century manuscript in the British Museum (Sloane, 1764). As the passage has never been printed I quote it in full (fol. 3):

ffor to knowe an hors and the properteys that aruⁿ best
in hym yong or old:—

The best colore is blacke baye wyt a gylt mowthe and
gylt flankys and vnther y^e horsys sydys the same color so
y^e hyss lyppis be full of rybbys for that sinifijt the hors
fersse hertyd. Now to knowe the beawte of y^e hors se
y^e he haue a wyte sterre in the forhed or a wyte feder on
the nose or a wyte foote behynde and se that he haue a
lytyl hedde and lene, and grett eyne, schorth herys, wyde
nossethrellys, brode forhed, longhe at y^e rayne, thyn mane,
brod brest and syde brawnyd and lene knees, brode
leghys and thynne, grete senowys, schorte pastron and
brode fote, schorthe backyd, syde Rybbyd and bygh
Rowmpe, a longh stote and smale stonys in his qodd.
And that he stond Rygte vppe on alle hys fete euerychon
agens other And the[se] be y^e best properteys, etc.¹

Distinctly mediæval in conception are the lists
of good points in which the horse is described by
comparison with other animals.² According to one
of these, 'A good horse must have XV properteys
and condicions, that is to witte, iij. of a man, iij.
of a woman, iij. of a fox, iij. of an hare, and iij. of

¹ The scribe appears to have taken this list of good points from
some treatise on the horse, for a little later (fol. 4a) he notes:
'Explicit liber condicionis equorum.' I am not able to identify
this treatise.

² Descriptions of this type are found not only in England,
but in Italy and Germany, and probably circulated throughout
mediæval Europe.

an asse.¹ According to another, the number of properties was twenty-five: viz., 'iiii off a lyon, iiii of an ox, iiii off an asse, iiii off an hare and iiii of a fox, and v of a woman.'² Finally, in Anthony Fitzherbert's 'Boke of Husbandry' the list of properties is expanded to fifty-four: 'that is to say, ii. of a man, ii. of a bauson or a badger, iiii. of a lyon, ix. of an oxe, ix. of a hare, ix. of a foxe, ix. of an asse, and x. of a woman.'³ These descriptions by comparison, though agreeing in many points with the classical lists, are plainly designed by their half-humorous tone for popular circulation. But however widely they may have circulated, they appear to have exerted slight influence, or none at all, upon Elizabethan literary tradition, and for this reason may here be dismissed from further consideration.

Finally, there remain to be examined the numerous books on horsemanship which first made their appearance in Italy about the middle of the sixteenth century. Though one finds frequent reference in these treatises to Varro, Vergil, or Columella, the material in them is not drawn from classical tradition alone. Indeed, in compiling

¹ For the text of this description (from Lansdowne MS. 762) see W. H. Hulme, 'Mid. Eng. Harrowing of Hell,' E. E. T. S. Ext. Ser. C., p. xxv., note 1; it occurs also in Trin. Col. Camb. MS. O.9.38, fol. 49a.

² Printed by Hulme (*loc. cit.*) from Cotton MS. Galba E. ix.; in occurs also in Sloane MS. 1201, fol. 9a.

³ Ed. 1534, fol. 43b-44b. Of the items in Fitzherbert's list, no less than twenty-three are found in the 'XXV. propertes,' six more are found in the 'XV. propertyes,' and nine others appear in the list quoted above from Sloane MS. 1764. His fifty-four properties have evidently been compiled from several sources.

their lists of the points of the horse, the authors of these treatises appear to have depended more directly upon the mediæval veterinarians than upon the classical writers. The earliest and most important of these works on horsemanship is F. Grisone's '*Gli Ordini de Cavalcare*,' first published at Naples in 1550, and repeatedly reprinted. Grisone presents us with a list of no less than thirty 'points,' some of which are discussed with much detail.¹ In compiling this list he has freely mingled classical and mediæval tradition. Of the classical writers his most important source seems to be Columella. But his greatest indebtedness was not to Columella or any of the ancients, but to Ruffo. A translation of Grisone's treatise was published in London a few years later by Thomas Blundevill under the title: '*A new booke containing the arte of ryding, and breakinge greate Horses, together with the shapes and Figures of many and diuers kyndes of Byttes*,' etc.² Inasmuch as we are chiefly concerned with Grisone's description of the horse on account of its influence in England, I quote Blundevill's translation rather than the Italian text, somewhat abridging prolix details which do not concern us. The description occurs in chap. iii., 'What shape a good horse ought to haue.'

¹ In the edition of 1550 the points of the horse will be found on fol. 8-9.

² For this reference to Blundevill I am indebted to Professor William Ridgeway, author of '*The Origin and Influence of the Thoroughbred Horse*,' Cambridge, 1905. To my friend Mr. Stephen Gaselee, of Magdalene College, I am under obligation for calling my attention to Professor Ridgeway's book, and thus putting me on the track of this material.

170 SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE.

A good horse then woulde haue a blacke, smothe, drie,
large, round, and hollowe houe

The Crowns aboue his houes would be smal and
heary.

His pastors short, and that neither to lowe nor yeat to
hyghe

His ioyntes great, with long feawter lockes behynde,
whyche is a sygne of force.

His legges straight and broade.

His knees great, leane and plaine.

His thighes ful of sinewes, the bones whereof would
be short, equal, iust and well proporcioned

His shoulders, longe, large, and full of fleashe.

His breast, large and rounde.

His neck rather long then shorte, . . . bendinge in
the midst

His eares small or rather sharpe, and standinge righte
vppe

His forehead leane and large.

His eyes blacke and greate.

The hollownesse of hys browes wel filled and shootinge
outwarde.

His Jawes slender and leane.

His nostrells so open and puffed vppe as you may se
the readde within, apt to receyue ayre.

His mouth great.

His mane would be thynne and longe

His wythers or walleyes woulde not only be sharpe-
pointed, but also right and straight

His backe woulde be shorte

His sides woulde be longe and large

His beally long and great

His flankes not gawnte, but full

His Rompe rounde and plaine, wyth the fall of a litle
gutter

His thighes large and longe, with bones well fashyoned
and full of fleashe on eyther side.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 171

The hammes wherof if they be leane, dry and straight, and the houghes large and crooked like a hart, it is a signe of swiftnes.

His taile woulde be full of heares, and longe downe to the grounde, the tronchen wherof must be of a measurable bignes and wel couchid betwixte hys thighes . . .

Grisone's treatise was translated, not only into English, but also into French, Spanish, and German. Of its influence in France, interesting evidence appears in the description of the horse by Du Bartas¹ to which reference has already been made. For a careful comparison of the points enumerated in these lines establishes their direct dependence upon Grisone's list. The French poet, to be sure, condenses his description by omitting many points which do not serve his purpose. But the points which he retains not only agree closely with the corresponding items in Grisone's text, but to a considerable extent follow the same order.

Two other Italian treatises on horsemanship, which appeared not long after the 'Ordini de Cavalcare,' may be dismissed with a brief reference: Pasqual Caracciolo's 'La Gloria del Cavallo' (Venice, 1567) and Claudio Corte's 'Il Cavallarizzo' (Venice, 1573). The former appears to have had little or no influence in England—at least I have failed to note any reference to it by the Elizabethans. Corte's treatise, on the other hand, was translated into English in abridged form by Thomas Bedingfield in 1584,² but in this translation the

¹ 'La Seconde Semaine,' 1 Journee, Les Artifices.

² 'The Art of Riding . . . written at large in the Italian toong by Maister C.C. . . . Brieflie reduced into certaine English discourses.'

list of 'points' does not appear. Corte's list of points' is much shorter than that of Grisone, upon which, nevertheless, it seems to show some dependence. The latter half of Corte's description, it is interesting to note, closely follows Rusio's 'Liber Marescalcie'—except in the matter of the mane. Here Corte deliberately returns to the opinion of the classical writers, with whom elsewhere in his treatise he repeatedly shows a first-hand acquaintance.²

We are now prepared to consider the relation of these catalogues of points to Shakespeare's description of the horse in 'Venus and Adonis.' It is true, of course, that a young man who had but recently gone up from the country to London might be supposed to know something about horses outside of books. And many a vivid descriptive touch in this very poem bears witness to Shakespeare's close observation in the lanes and pastures of Warwickshire. But it is not with the picture as a whole that we are at present concerned, but merely with the two stanzas in which the points of the horse are formally catalogued. For convenience I quote the text of these lines (preserving the spelling of the first Quarto):

271— His eares vp prickt, his braided hanging mane
Vpon his compast crest now stand on end,
His nostrils drinke the aire, and forth againe
As from a fornace, vapors doth he send:

¹ Lib. I., cap. 33, 'Come dee essere lo stallone.'

² Thus it may be noted that Corte translates in full (ed. 1573, fol. 32^b) the description of the horse in Nemesian's 'Cynegeticon'—certainly one of the lesser stars in this galaxy.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 173

His eye which scornfully glisters like fire,
Shewes his hote courage, and his high desire.

.

295—

Round hooft, short ioynted, fetlocks shag, and long,
Broad breast, full eye, small head, and nostrill wide,
High crest, short eares, straight legs & passing strong,
Thin mane, thicke taile, broad buttock, tender hide:
Looke what a Horse should haue, he did not lack,
Saue a proud rider on so proud a back.

It needs no argument, after the numerous catalogues of 'points' which we have examined, to establish the fact that Shakespeare's list is not an independent compilation. It is no longer a question of the influence of Du Bartas—or, if Professor Dodge prefers, of Du Bartas and Pulci. Underlying these lines in 'Venus and Adonis' we now recognize a literary tradition as to the points of the horse, whose origin is to be traced back ultimately to Rome and Greece. But the greater the number of similar catalogues in existence, the greater becomes the difficulty of determining the immediate point of contact between Shakespeare and this tradition.

Our task will be made easier if we begin by comparing the items in Shakespeare's list with those English texts which he could have easily consulted. The list of points in the Sloane MS. may be omitted, for the reason that, so far as I am aware, it was never put into print. Fitzherbert's 'Boke of Husbandry' may also be dismissed, first because it presents no special similarities to the lines in 'Venus and Adonis,' and secondly, because in arranging the points according to their

174 SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE.

resemblance to other animals, it follows an altogether different plan. There remain to be considered, therefore, the following English texts, any one of which would easily have been accessible to Shakespeare: (1) 'Batman uppon Bartholome,' (2) Gooze's 'Foure Bookes of Husbandry,' (3) Blundevill's 'Arte of Ryding,' and (4) a second list by Blundevill, in which the points of the horse are briefly summarised, in Part 1 of his 'Fower chiefyst offices belongyng to Horsemanshippe,' first published at London in 1565.¹ In the 'Fower chiefyst Offices,' Blundevill's translation of Grisone, originally published separately, was also included as 'Part 2,' so that in this and subsequent editions both of Blundevill's lists were accessible in a single volume.

In order to bring out as clearly as possible the points of similarity between Shakespeare's phrases and those in the pre-Shakespearean texts, I have arranged them in the following parallel column, indicating by a figure in parenthesis the text from which the phrase in question is taken:

'VENUS AND ADONIS.'

PRE-SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS.

Round hoof't

1. hoofe well pight and round
2. hoofes . . . hard and sound, round and hollowe
3. A blacke, smothe, drie, large, round and hollowe houe
4. rounde, smouthe, blacke, harde, hollow, and sounding houes

short ioynted

3. his ioyntes great
4. great iointes

¹ A second edition appeared in 1570 and a third in 1580. Still other editions, later than 'Venus and Adonis,' may here be neglected.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 175

'VENUS AND ADONIS.'

fetlocks shag and long

Broad breast

full eye

(275-6) His eye, which
scornfully glistere like
fire, Shewes his hote
courage.

small head

nostrill wide

(273) His nostrils drinke
the aire

High crest

(272) his compast crest

short eares

(271) his eares vp-prickt

straight legs and passing strong

Thin mane

thicke taile

broad buttock

tender hide

PRE-SHAKESPEAREAN TEXTS.

3. with long feawter lockes behynde

4. with longe fewerlockes

1. Broad breasted

2. brest greate and brode

3. his breast large and rounde

4. a brode brest

1. eyen great

2. his eyes great, bluddy and fiery, and
standing out of his head, which is
a signe of quicknes and liuelynes.

3. his eyes black and greate

4. great eyes and blacke

1. lytle head

2. had small and leane

4. a short and slender heade

1. the nostrills large

2. The nostrills must bee wyde the
better to receaue ayre

3. His nostrells so open and puffed vppe
as you may se the readde within,
apt to receyue ayre

4. wyde nostrhiels

3. his neck . . . bendinge in the midst

4. a necke . . . the creast wherof would
be rysyng in the middes

1. eares little and sharpe

2. The eares must bee shorte, standing
vpriht and stirring

3. His eares small or rather sharpe, and
standinge right vppe

4. short eares and sharpe

2. The legges & the thyes . . . euen
straight and sound

3. His legges straight and broade

4. stronge legges

3. His mane would be thynne and long

2. His tayle would be longe

3. His taile would be full of heares and
longe downe to the ground

4. a long and bushye tayle

2. His buttockes large and ful of fleshe

4. great round buttockes

176 SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE.

This parallel column, of course, is presented merely as a convenient means of comparison, and is not intended to imply that the passage in 'Venus and Adonis' was compiled on the basis of precisely these four texts. Who shall say that still other treatises containing similar descriptions of the horse may not have been circulating in England at the time Shakespeare's poem was written? Moreover, a number of the phrases in this list find equally close parallels in classical tradition.¹ But even when due allowance has been made for other possibilities, it is surely interesting to find practically every item in Shakespeare's description paralleled in these earlier English texts.

We may proceed further to note particularly one or two resemblances to Shakespeare which occur only in Blundevill's 'Arte of Ryding.' These two agree against the others in favouring the thin mane. Batman and the 'Foure Bookes of Husbandry,' on the other hand, give us a 'mane thicke'; and Blundevill himself, in his 'Fower chiefyst Offices,' varies from his previous catalogue by writing instead, 'a crispe main.' The thin mane first makes its appearance, as we have already seen, in the Middle Ages, and is directly opposed to classical tradition. In the sixteenth century there was a sharp difference of opinion among the authorities upon the question of the thin or the thick mane. Grisone, in expressing his preference for the former, recognised that others held the

¹ No less than six of these parallels appear in the text of Columella: 'ungulae rotundae, pectus latum, exiguum caput, nares apertae, auriculae breves et arrectae, cauda longa et setosa.'

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 177

contrary opinion, and endeavoured as best he could to reconcile the two views:

I crini rari & lunghi; & non vitupero l'opinion di chi uouole che siano folti, perche non essendo souerchi, et in molta quantita, pur sono di stima: & se sono crespi ò ueramente calui dinotano più gagliardezza. Se fossero grossi egli sarebbe di robusta natura, così quanto più fossero sottili, tanto maggiormente dimostrerebbe segno di buon senso, & oprarsi leggiero, & di esser delicato, non troppo gagliardo nel soffrire.¹

On the other hand, Corte—very possibly with a direct allusion to Grisone in his reference to 'alcuno moderno'—defended the thick mane and supported his opinion by appealing to classical authorities:

Per il che non so come alcuno moderno tenga così buoni i caualli, che hanno *i crini sparsi*, per usar il suo proprio uocabulo: uolendo Vergilio, che gli habbia folti, & non rari, come molt' altri uogliono. non niego però, che i crini rari non siano anco di buono inditio, & che emedesimante i lunghi & distesi et molli, non diano segno di buona, & piaceuole natura, perche si causano da natura humida, et temperata; ma dico bene che se gli sparti, & crespi, dinotano uigore et forza per la calidità naturale, che dimostrano nel cauallo; i grossi folti, & crespi maggior robustezza, & fortezza di complessione,

¹ Blundevill's translation is as follows: 'His mane would be thynne and longe, albeit I do not mislike the opinion of those that would haue it to be thicke, so that it be not ouerthycke, for as the thynnesse betokeneth apptnesse to be taught, so doth the indifferent thыcknes betoken strength.' One may refer also to Pasqual Caracciolo's discussion of this question of the mane in his 'Gloria del Cavallo' (ed. 1567, p. 161).

178 SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE.

ch'io sempre m'atterrei à questi con Vergilio, con Columella, & con Varrone.¹

The partisans of the thick mane, with the authority of classical tradition behind them, distinctly outnumbered their opponents. In fact, in all the descriptions of the horse in English previous to the appearance of 'Venus and Adonis' the thin mane occurs, so far as I am aware, only twice: in the Sloane MS. list, and in Blundevill's 'Arte of Ryding'—one of the best known books on horsemanship in Elizabethan England, and therefore a source which may easily have been known to Shakespeare. The 'thin mane' in 'Venus and Adonis,' then, points strongly, it seems to me, to the influence of Blundevill's treatise.² A further point of agreement between Shakespeare and Blundevill appears in the matter of the fetlocks. The other English texts have no

¹ 'Il Cavallerizzo,' ed. 1573, fol. 31^a. This paragraph may be translated: 'Therefore I cannot understand how a certain modern (writer) should take it as a good point in horses that they have "thin manes," to quote his own word. Vergil would have the mane thick, and not thin as many others prefer. Yet I do not deny that the thin mane may also be a good sign and further that a long, thin, soft mane may not indicate a good and gentle disposition, because produced by a humid and well-tempered nature. But if the thin and curly mane on account of the natural heat which it shows in a horse denotes vigor and strength, I affirm that a long, thick, curly mane indicates greater robustness and strength of constitution; and on this point I take my stand still with Vergil, Columella and Varro.'

² Blundevill's influence may be recognized also in the preference for the thin mane in Markham's 'Cavelarice.' Sylvester's insertion of 'thin' in his translation of Du Bartas is perhaps due to Blundevill, or possibly to the 'Venus and Adonis' itself.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE. 179

corresponding item, nor will one find it in any of the other lists which have been cited.

It is altogether unlikely that Shakespeare's acquaintance with catalogues of the points of the horse was confined to Blundevill's treatise. But the evidence at hand does not enable us to identify positively any supplementary source. There is some slight evidence that he was also acquainted with Googe's 'Foure Bookes of Husbandry,' though I put forward this suggestion with much diffidence. The description of the horse's eyes in the 'Foure Bookes of Husbandry,' as noted above, certainly offers an interesting parallel to lines 275-6 of the 'Venus and Adonis'; especially since it is one not frequently met with.¹ Moreover, if Shakespeare actually read the catalogue of points in the 'Foure Bookes,' his eye would necessarily have lighted upon Googe's translation of the passage in the 'Georgics,' which directly followed it. Some of these lines have sufficient resemblance to lines 271-74 of the 'Venus and Adonis'² to justify quoting them in this connection:

if farr away

There happen any noyse, he stamper, and quiet cannot rest.
But praunceth here and there, as if some sprite were in
his brest.

His eares he sets upright, and from his nose the fiery flame
Doth seeme to come, while as he snuffes, & snorthes at
the same.

¹ In classical tradition it appears only in Pollux's 'Onomasticon.'

² I have not included lines 265-70 in this comparison for the reason that these lines owe a more direct obligation to Marlowe's 'Hero and Leander' (2nd Sestiad, vv. 141-44).

180 SHAKESPEARE AND THE HORSE.

He scraping standes, and making deep a hole, he pawes
the ground
Whiles as aloud his horned houfe, al hollowed seemes
to sound.

Whether Googe's translation supplied the medium or not, I cannot rid my mind of the suspicion that reminiscences of the passage in the 'Georgics' are present in Shakespeare's description of the horse.¹

Concerning these details opinion must always be more or less conjectural. Nor are they matters of importance for our present purpose. The object of the present paper has been to bring out the large element of tradition embodied in Shakespeare's catalogue of the points of the horse, and this object, I think, has been accomplished. It may possibly be discovered hereafter that Shakespeare's indebtedness was not to Blundevill's treatise, but to some source hitherto unrecognized. Yet, though the *results* of the source-hunter are never secure against the wider researches of those who follow him, such modifications do not weaken, but rather confirm, the validity of his *processes*. For the sole purpose of such investigation of sources is to clear away pre-conceptions and to build upon a foundation of established fact.

CARLETON BROWN.

¹ Another metrical translation of the 'Georgics,' by Abraham Fleming, was published in 1589.

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

ALTHOUGH not yet published, the lectures on Chateaubriand which M. Jules Lemaître has lately been delivering at the Sorbonne have already caused an extraordinary revival of interest in Chateaubriand and his work. And no wonder! For however literary fashions may change, from the point of view of literary history and evolution, Chateaubriand is the greatest name and the greatest influence of the nineteenth century in France. That fact is well insisted on by Victor Giraud in his interesting volume entitled, '*Nouvelles études sur Chateaubriand: essais d'histoire morale et littéraire.*' Giraud goes fully into the question of Chateaubriand's literary influence in the concluding chapter, '*Le sillage de Chateaubriand,*' where he demonstrates how the whole of 'romantisme' is contained in Chateaubriand's work: it embodies historical, mediæval, exotic, and Catholic elements; individualism, lyrism, sentimentalism are there, and so is a passionate love of nature. Classical 'romantisme' is there too, for Chateaubriand never repudiates the inheritance of a glorious past, but combines taste and reverence for the masterpieces of antiquity with eager search for what is new. The authors who form the French

romantic school proper owe to Chateaubriand the inspiration of their themes, their style, their conception of the world, and their manner of expressing that conception. At fourteen Victor Hugo said: 'Je veux être Chateaubriand—ou rien.' Théophile Gautier wrote:

'Chateaubriand peut être considéré comme l'aïeul ou, si vous l'aimez mieux, comme le Sachem du Romantisme en France. Dans le *Génie du Christianisme* il restaure la cathédrale gothique; dans les *Natchez*, il rouvrit la grande nature fermée; dans *René*, il inventa la mélancolie et la passion moderne.'

Giraud declares further that in the '*Génie du Christianisme*' Chateaubriand created criticism as it is understood to-day; in the '*Martyrs*' and the '*Études historiques*' he inaugurated a new method of understanding and writing history; and surely '*Atala*' and '*René*' are in some degree responsible for the exotic novels of the present day.

From Lamartine and De Vigny to Anatole France and Bourget, there is scarcely any French writer of note who does not owe something to Chateaubriand. Béranger began by being his disciple, and Sainte-Beuve, although he depreciated Chateaubriand, was clearly working under his influence when he produced '*Volupté*' and '*Joseph Delorme*.' Without '*Les Martyrs*' Flaubert would not have written '*Salammbô*,' and although as thinkers and writers they are as the poles asunder, Comte owes much to the '*Génie du Christianisme*.' It was Brunetière who began

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 183

the rehabilitation of Chateaubriand, whose fame between 1830 and 1880 had fallen low, and he declared that during three generations Chateaubriand exercised 'une royauté littéraire' only to be compared with that of Voltaire.

A new conception of Chateaubriand is to be found in a volume by Albert Cassagne on 'La vie politique de François de Chateaubriand. Consulat, empire, première restauration.' Cassagne here declares that Chateaubriand was 'homme d'action par essence et poète par accident,' and shows him as a man of action, of the race of La Rochefoucauld and of Retz. The period treated in the book is from 1791 to 1815, and so, besides the hero, many interesting figures pass across its pages, among them Napoleon, De Bonald, Joubert, and Mme. de Beaumont. The book has something of the effect of an historical novel: our curiosity is excited by tales in which persons about whom we already know something play a considerable part.

Hitherto Chateaubriand's voluminous correspondence has been scattered through a number of works; the whole is now being collected and published by M. Louis Thomas as 'Correspondance générale de Chateaubriand,' with an introduction and notes. The first volume, covering the years 1789-1817, has just appeared, and four more at least, we are told, will be required to complete the edition. Thomas claims that when the letters can be read and studied all together, they will form one of the masterpieces of French literature, worthy of a place among the most famous collections of letters, and will also add a new work to those of the

great prose writer himself, a work in which the man 's'y livre davantage, sans pose, sans apprêt' than in the 'Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe.'

Chateaubriand was a great writer, and is fully worthy of such memorials as these books. His merits cannot be obscured by so-called modern scientific criticism. For the true critic of art does not change; he will ever bring 'le libre et vivant témoignage d'un esprit sur un autre esprit, d'une âme sur une autre âme,' the testimony, of course, being combined with knowledge, exact information, and objective research. In Giraud's words, Chateaubriand's position in French literature may be summed up thus:

'Il y en a peut-être de plus complets, si l'on veut: Lamartine, Hugo et Musset ont mieux possédé les deux instruments, la prose et les vers. Il n'y en a pas, au total, de plus fécond et de plus grand. Parmi tous ceux qui ont manié notre langue française, il n'en est aucun qui l'aient honoré davantage, qui en aient mieux connu et utilisé les infinies ressources, qui en aient tiré des effets plus nouveaux et plus heureux.'

It is in this way that Chateaubriand should be studied. There is too great a tendency to pay attention to his love affairs, sentimental and otherwise, and to neglect his importance as a man of letters. But serious students of literature know that the human interest is not obscured by the historical sense; in fact, when the latter is employed in the right spirit, the former is enhanced.

In 'Jean Chapelain 1595-1674 un poète protecteur des lettres au XVII^e siècle,' an historical

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 185

and literary study based on unpublished documents, Georges Collas gives an exhaustive account of a man who deserves a place in the history of French literature and civilization, a man whose career must interest all students and admirers of the national period of French history. Born in the reign of Henri IV., he entered on his literary career when Richelieu became minister, and when the Hôtel Rambouillet was in its greatest glory. He attained the zenith of his fame in the year of Corneille's 'Cid' and Descartes' 'Discours sur la méthode.' He was Richelieu's literary adviser, a friend of Retz, and an original member of the French Academy. He died just as 'le Roi-soleil' was beginning his glorious reign, when Racine was drawing tears from the Court over his 'Iphigénie,' and Boileau was publishing his 'Art poétique.' Fond of literature, passionately attached to politics, interested in medicine and science, he was acquainted with all that was being done in Europe by poets and scholars. There was scarcely an author, certainly in France, whom he did not advise or criticise, scarcely an institution on which he did not leave his mark. Indeed, Chapelain was everything except an epic poet, yet despite Boileau's ridicule, he is worth studying as a man, an author, and a patron of letters.

Collas' book, which was suggested by Tamizey de Larroque's 'Lettres de Jean Chapelain,' is divided into three parts, 'Avant la Pucelle, La Pucelle, et Après la Pucelle.'

French scholars are still industriously carrying on their researches in English literature. I have before

186 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

me at this moment a volume of 500 large octavo pages on Herrick, a pamphlet on Browning, and a work entitled 'English Fairy Poetry,' the last written in excellent English. Of the three, the Herrick is the most important. It is the thesis on which M. Floris Delattre, Professor of English at the Lycée Charlemagne, was granted the doctorate of the University of Paris. The sub-title is 'Contribution à l'étude de la poésie lyrique en Angleterre au dix-septième siècle.' The book is divided into three parts, dealing respectively with 'l'homme,' 'le poète,' and 'l'écrivain.' In the first Delattre has essayed a portrait of the man as he appeared to his contemporaries. The summing up of his character seems to me excellent. Herrick is a man of robust health; there is nothing languid about him:

'Il aime le vin capiteux et "non adultéré," la grosse chère, les bons compagnons. Il aime les femmes presque sans distinction. . . . Il jouit de la surface aimable des choses, sans prendre la peine de les approfondir pour les connaître. . . . Il y a en lui un élément calme, pondéré, positif même, qui le rattache à l'ancienne famille provinciale dont il est issu. . . . Il vit uniquement dans le tangible. . . . Il accepte les idées que sont courantes à l'époque, sans les vivifier jamais de son expérience individuelle.'

But, notwithstanding, in the domain of sensations and 'sentiments jolis,' Herrick is without a rival.

If Herrick's poetry possesses little originality, little depth, or little passion, sensibility and imagination predominate. He does not criticise life, he enjoys it; he is not a critic of life, but an artist of

life. He is especially the poet of human joy. Life as he represents it is—

'une fête de mai, toute claire de soleil et de fleurs. Les abeilles y font entendre sans répit le bourdonnement de leurs rondes dorées. Le poète s'avance vers nous avec un sourire, jouant sur son pipeau des airs légers, alertes, capricieux. Il peuple de rêves jolis sa solitude. Il fait déborder le vallon de ses notes fraîches.'

Indeed, he pipes as though he would never grow old.

Where, however, Herrick is original is in his attitude to country life, and M. Delattre brings out with great clearness that feature of Herrick's poems, one too seldom regarded by English critics, who are apt to neglect the fact that our poets appreciated Nature, even before the publication of 'The Seasons.' Herrick describes 'la fraîcheur, la claire gaîté, la charme de la campagne qu'il habite,' he is, in fact, the laureate of 'la vieille glèbe d'Angleterre.' He describes rural occupations with knowledge and delight, and as Delattre says, a 'paysan malgré lui,' he composed what may veritably be called English Georgics.

M. Delattre devotes a chapter to Herrick's religious poems. The mixture of frank paganism and real devotion, which is one of the most striking characteristics of Herrick's work, is perhaps not quite clearly brought out, but the critic shows in what way Herrick stands apart from the group of seventeenth century religious poets. He lays stress on Herrick's indubitable sincerity, and declares that he did not write his 'Noble Numbers' from a sense

of duty, but '*en dépit de sa morale si peu chrétienne spontanément et par conviction.*' At any rate, whatever was the moving cause, we owe to Herrick the triplet, characterised by Swinburne as '*divinely beautiful*' :

'We see Him come and know Him ours,
Who with His sunshine and His showers
Turns all the patient ground to flowers.'

The volume probably includes everything that needs to be known about Herrick and his work. The classification of the poems according to subject is most useful. Under the main heading, Herrick the poet of society, we have chapters on the king and court, friends, Devonshire peasants, on himself, women, and love. Under the heading, Herrick and the country, are chapters on pastoralism, rural life, folk-lore and fairy-lore; and under that of Herrick's wisdom, chapters on his moral and religious ideas. Technical criticism of him as a writer includes his debt to his forerunners, his style, versification, and the order and chronology of the *Hesperides*.

Lastly, M. Delattre is to be congratulated on his excellent translations, which form almost a third or the book. They are in a sort of rhythmical prose.

M. P. Berger, whose fine study of Blake is well known, has written a short pamphlet on Browning's poetry, eminently calculated to assist French readers to a right appreciation of it, and not unlikely to be useful to English students. It is a marvel of clear and concise criticism and explanation. He brings out very vividly Browning's wealth of characters :

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 189

'Philosophes calmes ou sceptiques de l'antiquité, moines hargneux, savants subtils ou rêveurs de moyen âge, esprits enthousiastes et artistes de la Renaissance, hommes de notre temps surtout, convaincus ou indifférents, froids ou passionnés, âmes insignifiantes, esprits morbides, ambitieux sans scrupules, amoureux désespérés, apôtres enthousiastes de tout ce qui est grand et noble, philosophes et savants, martyrs et imposteurs, femmes aux âmes nobles et aux cœurs si pur, se pressant en foules lumineuses, âmes viles parfois, hommes aux instincts grossiers, aux intelligences obtuses et aux cœurs étroits.'

We are almost reminded, though in a different kind, of the 'God's plenty' of Chaucer.

Berger sees, too, in Browning the poet of 'modernism,' although his personality is too strong to allow of strict labelling. The most striking point in Browning's faith, according to this critic, is that the imperfections of man are a sign of his superior destiny; in a word, Browning expounds the optimism of evil. Therefore he is the most 'fortifiant' of poets. His peculiar genius is summed up by the critic in the phrase: 'il n'est pour ainsi dire, ni poète ni philosophe, mais un peu de l'un et l'autre à la fois.' But I take it that all great poets are philosophers in so far as their outlook on life passes beyond the trivial and ephemeral and fixes itself on the important and enduring.

History and its by-ways always fill a prominent place in French literature.

Pierre de Vaissière does not intend his book, 'De quelques assassins. Récits du Temps des Troubles (XVI^e siècle),' to be merely a portrait gallery of assassins, but to assist a clearer

understanding of the history of the times in which the dramas were enacted. The victims are there as well as their murderers: François de Guise, Coligny, Henry IV. The manner of death of such important persons, with the causes that led to it and the consequences that resulted, are here studied in detail. Among the assassins whose careers are described are Jean Poltrot, Charles de Louviers, Jean Ganourtz *dit* Besme, and Jacques Clément. Greater knowledge of such men will, according to Vaissière, 'rendre compte pas seulement de l'esprit des mœurs, et du caractère d'une époque, mais en même temps de bien des points ignorés ou mal connus de l'histoire politique.'

New facts and an original point of view are to be found in the Vicomte de Motey's 'Un héros de la grande armée, Jean-Gaspard Hulot de Collart, officier supérieur d'artillerie (1780-1854).' The work is based on Hulot's professional notes, reports, and private correspondence, as well as on that of his brother, Baron Hulot the general, and on the archives of the French War Office. There is no doubt that very often the history of a subordinate person or action helps to throw light on events that are well known and on the policy of the leaders. In addition, this very carefully prepared volume fully illustrates the truth of Taine's words: 'Plus j'étudie en histoire, plus j'attribue de prix aux textes de première main, *abondants, caractéristiques et bien classés.*'

The importance of the Emperor Paul I. in the history of Russia is well brought out by M. K. Waliszewski in his new work, 'Le fils de la grande

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 191

Catherine, Paul I^{er} empereur de Russie, sa vie, son règne et sa mort 1754-1801 d'après des documents nouveaux et en grande partie inédits.' Paul I. of Russia is one of the most enigmatic figures in history. Was he or was he not mad? However that may be, his reign is much more than a mere dramatic episode in the history of modern Russia, his work had an extended compass and a lasting effect: it has survived the workman. It may have the aspect of paradox, even of caricature; but are not paradox and caricature present to-day in the 'spectacle que nous offre l'immense empire, Etat constitutionnel et parlementaire, gouverné par un souverain autocrate, qui passe pour n'avoir rien abdiqué de ses droits'? The book is most interesting, and certainly helpful to a better understanding of modern Russia.

Two books that make delightful reading of the lighter kind are the second volume of Emile Bergerat's 'Souvenirs d'un enfant de Paris' (1872-1880), and Charles Samaran's 'D'Artagnan, capitaine des mousquetaires du roi.' In the first we have sprightly accounts of all the interesting people in Paris during those years of light-hearted, gay bohemianism. The book, however, is not suitable for the reading of the young people our dramatic censors seek so carefully to protect. M. Samaran gives us the true history of a hero of romance who was in reality 'un cadet de Gascogne plein de ressources, un soldat d'élite de l'ancienne France, pénétré de ses devoirs, parfait serviteur de son roi, prêt à verser son sang pour lui, à tout moment.'

* * * * *

192 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

The following recently published books deserve attention :—

Les contemporains étrangers. Par Maurice Muret.

The author declares that 'le cosmopolitisme littéraire procure à ceux qui le pratiquent des plaisirs intellectuels raffinés, multipliés à l'infini.' Bernard Shaw is the only English contemporary noticed.

L'œuvre scientifique de Blaise Pascal. Bibliographie critique et analyse de tous les travaux qui s'y rapportent. Par Albert Maire.

The preface is by Pierre Duhem. The book is a thorough piece of work—the author is the Librarian of the Sorbonne—and indispensable to students of the history of science.

Du Luthéranisme au Protestantisme. Evolution de Luther de 1517 à 1528. Par Léon Cristiani.

Not a biography: the life is only dealt with so far as is necessary for following the inward drama that led to a new era in the history of Christianity.

Geschichte der Alttestamentlichen Religion kritisch dargestellt. Von Eduard König.

The purpose of the work is to assist historical research.

Godeau, évêque de Grasse et de Vence (1605-1672). Première partie. Jeunesse de Godeau et son épiscopat à Grasse de 1636 à 1639. Par Georges Doublet.

The work will be completed in two further parts, 1640-53, and 1654-72. Godeau was one of the first members of the French Academy.

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 193

Le directoire et la paix de l'Europe des traités de Bâle à la deuxième Coalition 1795-99. Par Raymond Guyot.

The author, founding his conclusions on new documents studied in a new way, thinks that Europe would have been quite willing in 1797 to have accepted definitive peace.

Die amerikanische Literatur. Von Dr. C. Alphonso Smith.

Lectures given at the University of Berlin, 1910-11. A very useful brief survey of the history and evolution of American literature.

W. A. Mozart. Sa vie musicale et son œuvre de l'enfance à la pleine maturité, 1750-77. Par T. de Wyzewa and G. de Saint-Foix.

An 'essai de biographie critique.' It contains a new chronological catalogue of Mozart's works.

Richard Strauss. Von Max Steinitzer.

A good account of the modern composer's work.

Monuments de l'art ancien russe. Published by the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts at St. Petersburg.

A sumptuous volume with fine illustrations, many in colour.

Von Apelles zu Böcklin und weiter. Gesammelte kunstgeschichtliche Aufsätze, Vorträge und Besprechungen. Von Karl Woermann. Vol. I.

This volume goes to the seventeenth century, and among the subjects treated are the art of antiquity, the art of the Italian renaissance, and old German art.

* * * * *

III.

O

194 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

Among new novels the following are the most important :—

Les frontières du cœur. Par Victor Margueritte.

Du mouron pour les petits oiseaux. Par Léon de Tinseau.

La neige sur les pas. Par Henry Bordeaux.

A variation on the theme that forgiveness is better than revenge.

Monsieur de Lourdines. Par Alphonse de Chateaubriant.

This novel, which relates the life of a 'gentilhomme campagnard,' has obtained the 'Prix Goncourt.'

La bonne fortune de Toto. Par Gyp.

An amusing comedy in the dialogue form usual with this writer on contemporary Parisian manners.

La serre de l'aigle. Par Georges Ohnet.

A mixture of history and legend, the combination being treated as romance.

Die Burgkinder. Von Rudolf Herzog.

Die Göttinnen oder die drei Romane der Herzogin von Assy. Von Heinrich Mann.

ELIZABETH LEE.

THE SO-CALLED GUTENBERG DOCUMENTS.¹

IN the foregoing articles² I have a second time endeavoured to analyse and explain the contents of all the documents, whether authentic or forged, that relate or are presumed to relate to Johann Gutenberg of Mainz, whom some would fain regard as the inventor of printing with moveable types. My first essay on these documents, published in 1882 (London, Quaritch) under the title 'Gutenberg, was he the Inventor of Printing?' was incomplete, as I had been unable to find the original Notarial Instrument of the lawsuit of 1455 between Fust and Gutenberg. It was rediscovered in 1889, and since then various treatises on Gutenberg and the incunabula attributed to him, and new data bearing on the Haarlem claims to the invention, have shed so much light on the question of the invention of printing, that a fresh examination of the documents relating to Gutenberg's career seemed to me both possible and desirable. I believe I have made it now clear that these documents (which cover the period 1420 to 1468-74) do not justify us in ascribing to him the

¹ Continued from page 89.

² See 'THE LIBRARY,' 1909, p. 152 *sqq.*, p. 253 *sqq.*, p. 386 *sqq.*; 1911, p. 183 *sqq.*, p. 289 *sqq.*, p. 396 *sqq.*; 1912, p. 64 *sqq.*

invention of printing, either at Strassburg or at Mainz, and that we may even reasonably ask whether Gutenberg ever printed anything.¹

In the present essay I principally deal with Gutenberg's supposed claims as based on the twenty-seven documents generally assumed to be genuine, which Dr. Karl Schorbach, the Strassburg Librarian, has recently interpreted and published in the Supplement to the 'Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen' for 1900. Incidentally, however, I also treat of the types and books which some of the chief German bibliographers of the present day ascribe, without adequate evidence, to Gutenberg.

The documents assumed to be genuine I have numbered I to XXVII, in accordance with Schorbach's numbering, so that those who may wish to compare my explanations with his, which are more elaborate and replete with admiration for Gutenberg, will merely have to turn to the corresponding number in his treatise.

But besides the twenty-seven documents supposed to be authentic, there are eight others (including pieces of wood of a supposed Gutenberg-press of 1441) now known to be forgeries. These are not included in Schorbach's numbering, because he mentions some of them only in notes, the others not at all. But these fabrications are here dealt with in their apparent chronological order, so as to warn those who desire to study the arguments for and against Gutenberg's claims, that with respect to this subject we stand on

¹ See also my article 'Typography' in the new 'Encyclopædia Britannica.'

slippery ground, all the more so as these eight fictitious documents were forged at different times, by different persons and in various places, for the purpose of filling up gaps in Gutenberg's life, or representing him as residing in certain towns and at times suitable to the forger's notions. When we bear this alarming ramification of forgery in mind, we may the more readily appreciate the suspicions which rest even on some of the documents supposed to be genuine.

The eight fabrications appear here under the numbers IA (24th March, 1424, a fictitious letter from Gutenberg to his sister); XIA (1441, *relics* of a Gutenberg-press!); XIXA (the year 1453 written in Arabic numerals of old form at the foot of the last leaf of a copy of the 42-line Bible now in the Klemm collection at Leipzig); XXA (forged copies of the 1455 Letters of Indulgence found in Herr Culemann's possession after his death); and XXIIA (1458), XXIIb (1459), XXIIc (1460), XXIVA (1463), all meant to prove that Gutenberg had continued to print at Mainz after his separation from Fust and Schoeffer; XXVIA (2nd February, 1468) is not a forgery, but an entry of the name 'Johannes zum Ginsefleis,' which perhaps relates to a granduncle of Gutenberg's, but has erroneously been connected with him.

Even some of the twenty-seven documents supposed to be genuine are suspected or declared to be frauds in Germany. For instance, Dr. Bockenheim rejects at least four of them as fictions—namely, Nos. VI (14th March, 1434); X (the breach of promise case of 1437), XI (the Strassburg

Law-suit of 1439), and, to crown all, the famous Law-suit of 6th November, 1455 (No. XX), the 'palladium' of the Gutenberg claims.

As No. VI, if genuine, would only prove that Gutenberg resided at Strassburg in 1434, we say no more about it, nor about the Nos. I-V, VII-IX, XII, XIV-XVI, and XIX, which merely give us further clues as to his existence or his whereabouts. Nor can No. X (the breach of promise case of 1437) help us much. But it is well to remember that Schoepflin (of whom we speak later on) repeatedly alluded to it, in 1740 (twice), in 1741, 1760, and 1761, describing it as a 'Charta,' or as having been 'communicated' to him by Wencker. But although of every other document known to him he published the text in full, he merely alluded to No. X. And when, in 1761, he was asked for a copy of this 'Charta,' he replied that it did not exist, and that the information was only contained in an 'annotation.' But not even this 'annotation' was produced, and nobody has ever seen it. Yet, on the strength or in amplification of it, Schoepflin stated in print that Gutenberg had married the lady, had brought up a family and had children in 1444.

When we leave aside the fictitious documents and those that cannot assist us in the controversy, there remain (besides the Law-suit of 1439) two groups of documents of which we have to say a few more words.

The first group consists of the documents XIII (1442), XVII (1442-58), XVIII (1448), XX (1455), XXII (1457-61), XXIII (1461), XXIV

(1461-74), XXV (1465), XXVII (1468). They show Gutenberg's impecunious and embarrassed circumstances from 1442 onwards; and how in 1442, 1448, 1450 and 1452 he contracted one debt after another and failed to repay any of them, or do the work for which he apparently borrowed the money.

The second group consists of the two remaining documents XXI (1457) and XXVI (1467-8), which show that Gutenberg was closely connected with the St. Victor Stift, near Mainz, and that to his sojourn in that Monastery, in combination with some other circumstances, we can trace the fiction that he was the inventor of printing.

As regards the Records of the Strassburg Lawsuit of 1439 (No. XI) we cannot speak with certainty either for or against their authenticity, as the three Registers (A, B, C) in which they were said to have been written down have perished. Volume C, alleged to have contained the Sentence of the Strassburg Senate, was burnt in 1793 by the Revolutionists, apparently without ever having been seen by anybody (except Wencker who 'discovered' it), not even by Schoepflin, who in 1760 published this sentence for the first time, as 'communicated' to him by Wencker. The two other Registers (A and B) found, according to Schoepflin, in 1745¹ by himself and the Strassburg

¹ Schoepflin speaks only of finding Vol. A in 1745. But he refers ('Vind. typ.', p. 27, Doc. IV) to Vol. B as 'Protocollum Senatus majoris,' and published Beildeck's complaint and the List of Witnesses from it without saying when and where he discovered it.

Archivist Barthius, were burnt in 1870 during the siege of Strassburg.

I treated of this law-suit in my 'Gutenberg, was he the Inventor of Printing?' (p. 23 *sqq.*, p. 185 *sqq.*), and gave various reasons for suspecting it. A renewed examination has more than confirmed my suspicions, and in 'THE LIBRARY' for 1909, p. 253 *sqq.*, I pointed out the mysterious and unnatural silence which the litigants, their numerous witnesses (all persons in different walks of life), and even the judges preserve regarding the nature and scope of the 'work' or the 'arts' in dispute.

The most trifling things are described with great minuteness. We hear that Gutenberg was manufacturing 'looking-glasses,' and had taught the 'polishing of stones.' A press, pieces, buttons, tools, formes, lead, etc., are mentioned, but no one says for what purpose these things were used; we only learn that there is question of a 'work,' a 'trade,' an 'art,' etc. Gutenberg had some 'secrets,' but though the plaintiff and his witnesses seem to have been acquainted with them, and had every reason to reveal them to the Court in order to put pressure on the defendant, no one took the trouble to do so, while the judges appear to have made no enquiries about these secrets.

Apart from this strange vagueness and the indefinite expressions of everyone involved in this trial, Bockenheimer points out (1) that proceedings of this description were contrary to the legal usages prevailing at Strassburg in 1436-9, so that the Records appear to have been drawn up by some person or persons ignorant of the legal, social

and local customs of that period; (2) that there are various inconsistencies and improbabilities in the Records; and (3) that no Records of Strassburg law-suits earlier than the sixteenth century are in existence.

We must further bear in mind that these Records began to make their appearance just at a time (1740) when several cities of Germany celebrated a tercentenary of a supposed Mainz invention; but Schoepflin and his friends, on the other hand, contemplated the celebration of a tercentenary of a Strassburg invention, of which people had been speaking and writing for more than two centuries.

The assertion that printing was invented there appears to have been first made by Jac. Wimpfeling, who, while residing at Heidelberg (together with Adam Gelthuss, a relation of Gutenberg's), said in an epigram, published at Mainz in 1499, that Johan Gensfleisch (Ansicarus) had invented printing at Mainz. But in 1501, when he resided at Strassburg and wished to please the Senate of that City, he dedicated to them his 'Germania,' stating on p. 43 of that work, that 'Strassburg excelled through the origin of the art of printing though it was perfected at Mainz.' In 1502, in his 'Epithoma Germanorum,' Cap. lxxv. (not published till 1505), he wrote that Joan Gutenberg of Strassburg invented printing at Strassburg in 1440, but perfected it at Mainz. In 1508 he said ('Catal. Episcc. Argent.') that 'under Bishop Robertus the art was invented, though incomplete, by a certain Strassburger, who went to Mainz, joined others in investigating that art, and under

the guidance of Joan Genszfleisch, who was blind from old age, completed and finished it in the house Gutenberg.'

In 1521 Hier. Gebwiler asserted (in 'Panegir. Argent. 1521,' p. 19) that 'Mentel invented printing 74 years ago (= 1447), though the Mainz people ascribe the invention to Johan "Faust,"' and he assumed in a later MS. treatise that 'the art was first secretly invented (*excogitata*) by Mentel at Strassburg, and then first attempted (*tentata*) at Mainz, about 1440.'

Wimpheling's statement of 1502 was copied in 1537 by the Strassburg theologian Caspar Hedio (in 'Paral.'), who gave 1446 as the year of the invention; but in 1549 (Chronicle IV. 633) said that Gutenberg invented it at Mainz in 1450. At last Daniel Specklin (in a MS. Chronicle of Strassburg, c. 1580) stated that 'Johan Mentel invented the art in 1440, his brother-in-law Peter Schoeffer and Mart. Flack expanded it; his servant Johan Gensfleisch robbed him of the art, went secretly to Mainz, and there, assisted by the rich Gutenberg, perfected it; Mentel died broken-hearted, and Gensfleisch was punished by blindness.'

This story of a Strassburg invention, which, based on nothing (except perhaps the erroneous notion that Gutenberg was born at Strassburg), we see arise in 1501, lived on, was amplified and distorted, and cannot be said to be extinguished even now. Schoepflin believed it, though he favoured Gutenberg as the inventor, not Mentel. It was his theory and that of his friends, and of

their predecessors, that the invention had taken place, in an incomplete form and in secret, at Strassburg, *before* it was perfected at Mainz. But as everybody in his time talked of a Mainz date 1440-50, and others had done so before him, only a document that alluded to a mysterious mechanical process, already in operation before the earliest Mainz date, could serve his purpose. He was aware of the Documents of 1441 and 1442 (Nos. XII and XIII) discovered a few years before; but though they showed that Gutenberg was at Strassburg during these years, there was nothing mysterious in them, nor anything about a mechanism or an art. The sentence of the Strassburg Senate, however, then coming to light (!), provided him with everything.

In his *Programma*, published in 1740, when several cities celebrated the tercentenary of the (Mainz) invention, he pointed out that 'by choosing this year, the glory of the invention was unwittingly ascribed to Strassburg, as at the time of the birth of typography Gutenberg resided there, supported a family (!) there, and applied himself to the invention (!) and practice of several arts, for which purpose he formed various associations, investigating wondrous things, as we learn from the Strassburg judges when, in 1439, they decided a dispute between him and his associates to whom he had communicated his secrets. 'What forbids us,' he asks, 'to conjecture that among these secrets were also the rudiments of the art of typography?' In the same year, in a French dissertation on the origin of printing, he

repeated the above statements, and even amplified them by asserting that in 1444 Gutenberg had 'children' at Strassburg.

From these two dissertations published in 1740, when Schoepflin professed to know only the Sentence of the Senate, it is clear that he saw no harm in making statements about Gutenberg's 'family,' his 'marriage' and 'children,' which were not justified by any of his documents, and that he considered such vague and indefinite words in the Sentence as 'lead,' 'polish stones,' 'adventure,' 'Gutenberg teaching an art,' to indicate the 'rudiments of the typographical art.'

We do not know what Schoepflin's contemporaries thought of his *Programma* and dissertation. It requires courage to say that the *Sentence* referred to an 'invention of printing' or to 'printing,' unless one reads it with the preconceived idea that Gutenberg *was* the inventor, in which case the merest hint would suffice for the purpose.

But it is strange that no one remarked at the time that such a *Verdict* or *Sentence*, dated 12th December, 1439, and pronounced by the Senate of an important city like Strassburg, must have been preceded, about the same time, by a 'trial,' the proceedings of which would also be recorded. Neither Schoepflin nor Wencker said anything of such an obvious inference. Once on the scent by the finding of this 'Sentence,' and having the other Protocols of the Senate as much at hand as the Register in which Wencker professed to have found the Sentence, a few minutes or a few days would have sufficed for finding the other portions

(the Depositions, etc.) of the Records. Yet, according to Schoepflin's own words, five years elapsed before he accidentally (!), in the presence of Barthius (the successor of Wencker, who had died in 1743), found the other volume (A) of 1439.

Schorbach, who upholds the genuineness of the Records, remarks ('Festschrift,' in Supplem. to 'Centralbl.' 1900, p. 214) that 'if Schoepflin had fabricated (erdichtet) the acts, he would have clearly represented Gutenberg as having invented printing at Strassburg, as was his conviction (?). The industry, however, exercised there by Gutenberg is not distinctly called "book-printing" in the Records, but described in expressions so obscure and vague that their interpretation causes the greatest difficulties.'

That the wording of the Records, at least of their essential part, is 'vague,' will be admitted by all who wish to know the nature and object of Gutenberg's enterprises, more especially of his third. But this very vagueness arouses suspicion, because it is unnatural.

If, however, we could surmount our difficulties and suspicions, and took the Records as authentic, even so they would not justify us in connecting Gutenberg with 'printing,' were it not for three lines, which do not speak of 'book-printing,' nor say, in so many words, that Gutenberg invented that art at Strassburg, but would, if genuine, make it clear that Gutenberg had 'printed,' or, to be precise, had employed someone to 'print' for him, at Strassburg as early as 1436—that is, fully

fourteen years before he could have begun to print at Mainz. These three much-discussed lines purport to be the deposition of Hans Dünne, a goldsmith, one of Gutenberg's own witnesses, and to have been written in (the now destroyed) volume A, between the depositions of two other Gutenberg witnesses, Anth. Heilmann and Meidehart Stocker. De Laborde, in 1840, made a tracing of these three lines (Plate II., No. 10 of 'Débuts de l'imprimerie à Strassburg') which is above suspicion, whatever else may be suspected. According to that tracing and Schoepflin's text, they read: 'Item, Hanns Dünne the goldsmith has said that three years ago or thereabout he had earned from Gutenberg about hundred guilders solely (for) that which belongs to printing.'¹

In harmony with the indifference and mystery conspicuous throughout the whole of the Records, no one asked Dünne *what* or *where* he had 'printed.' But waiving this point, there is nothing obscure in these three lines, and if they were genuine, and formed part of genuine Records, they would be an authentic and clear testimony of Gutenberg having exercised the art of 'printing' at Strassburg as early as 1436 (!)—that is, fourteen (!) years before Gutenberg borrowed money from Johan Fust for making 'tools,' when he had nothing in the world to give to Fust as a pledge except these 'unmade' tools; eighteen (!) years before the first printed (Mainz) date (1454) on record; twenty (!) years

¹ 'Item Hanns Dünne der goltsmyt hat geseit das er vor dryen / Joren oder dobij Gutemberg by den hundert gulden abe verdienet habe/alleine das zu dem trucken gehöret.'

before the first printed Bible (B⁴²) was in the hands of the public, and one and twenty (!) years before Fust and Schoeffer commenced to advertise and describe the art of printing and its mechanism as a *new* art.

It is remarkable that the German bibliographers and all others who believe in this Law-suit of 1436-9, and accept the Records as genuine, yet cling to Mainz as the birth-place of printing, though it is clear that it could not have begun there before 1450, if so early.

The merest glance, however, at the three lines, as traced by De Laborde, suffices to realise that the third (all-important) line (*alleine das zu dem trucken gehöret*) has been added, by a different hand, to the first two lines of Dünne's deposition. The *e*'s alone show the difference between the writing of the two hands. It is impossible now to say who wrote the first two lines and who added the third, which was clearly added by way of afterthought. The form of the letters of the first two lines of this deposition also differs from that of the other passages traced by De Laborde. We have no contemporary Strassburg MSS. at our disposal to compare them with De Laborde's tracings, nor any writings of Schoepflin and Wencker, to ascertain whether they wrote these three lines or not. One thing is certain: if we have to reject one paragraph or even one line of these Records on account of its having been tampered with, we are bound to reject the whole of them, when there are so many other weighty grounds for suspecting them. De Laborde's tracings do not enable us to see whether there were

any *erasures* in the Register (A), but they show alterations, corrections and additions enough to augment, not diminish, our suspicion. According to Laborde's tracing No. 3, the name 'gutenberg' was added in the margin; likewise the words: 'that no one may know what it is, because he would not like that anybody saw it,' which were evidently intended to indicate Gutenberg's 'secret.' The line preceding this passage ran: 'min Juncker Hanns Guttemberg hatt uch gebetten das,' but it was, according to Schoepflin, deleted.

As has been pointed out before, a careful consideration of the text of the Records, and of all the circumstances surrounding them, makes it almost impossible not to agree with Dr. Bockenheimer's conclusions (published in 1900 at Mainz) that this 1439 Law-suit is a fiction from beginning to end. If it were otherwise we should long ago have found in the Annals of Strassburg or elsewhere some trace, however faint, of this curious printing-office (?), which was the subject of a long law-suit involving no fewer than forty or fifty different people (men and women), not to speak of several magistrates; which is alleged to have existed for at least three years, and to have been first of all a workshop for the polishing of stones and the manufacture of looking-glasses for pilgrimages, besides a number of other arts, trades, etc.

But who fabricated these Records? Everything points to Wencker and Schoepflin; to say more is at present impossible.

The Helmasperger Notarial protocol (No. XX), dated 6th November, 1455, records some pro-

ceedings in the law-suit brought by Johann Fust against Johann Gutenberg, for the recovery of two sums of money, with interest thereon, which he had advanced to Gutenberg. Fust's depositions occupy the lines 23 to 37, and are immediately followed by Gutenberg's reply in the lines 37 to 47.

This document is regarded in Germany as the most important of all the Gutenberg documents. The original seems to have been about 1600 in the hands of 'Faust' von Aschaffenburg, who pretended to descend from Joh. 'Fust,' and in Köhler's possession in 1741. Since then nothing but transcripts of it were known, till it was rediscovered in 1889, when we were told that thenceforth no unbiassed person could entertain any doubts as to Gutenberg's claims to the honour of the invention.

The text of this document, discussed in 'THE LIBRARY' for 1909 (p. 403 *sqq.*) and 1911 (p. 399 *sqq.*), shows that Fust, according to the amount of interest which he claimed in November, 1455, must have made his first advance to Gutenberg in August, 1450, his second in December, 1452.

We have likewise discussed most of the strange and tower-high theories built on this Instrument regarding Gutenberg's supposed invention, activity and performances, from 1450 to 1455, or before that time or later, and trust to have shown that, during the proceedings recorded in this Document, not a single word was uttered by Fust, or the judges, or the witnesses, not even by Gutenberg himself, to indicate that he was then regarded as the inventor of printing, though it was all important to the latter to have said so if it had been true. I have

also endeavoured to make it clear that all the circumstances recorded in the Document and elsewhere tend to prove that Gutenberg could not have printed anything before 1450, and that, if he did print anything at all during or after that year, it could not have been much. For our present summary it will suffice to repeat here the leading points of the Document.

Fust had stated to the judges, on some unnamed day before 6th November, 1455, as follows:

(1) he had, in good faith, furnished Gutenberg [about the 15th August, 1450] with 800 gulden in gold, wherewith (Gutenberg) *should* 'finish the work'; (2) Fust himself was unconcerned whether the work cost more or less; (3) Gutenberg *should* give (Fust) 6 g. interest on each hundred g.; (4) (Fust) had borrowed these 800 g. for Gutenberg on interest, and given them to him; (5) Gutenberg had not been content with them and complained that he had not yet had them all; (6) Fust, willing to please Gutenberg, had furnished him [about the 1st December, 1452] with 800 g. more than he (Fust), according to the tenor of the said schedule, had been obliged to Gutenberg; (7-12) as Fust himself had had to borrow this money and pay 6 % interest on it, and interest on the interest, and as Gutenberg had never paid any interest, Fust claimed 2020 gulden from him.

Fust nowhere explains what kind of 'work' he had expected Gutenberg to 'finish' with the money advanced by him in 1450 and 1452. But whatever it may have been, it is obvious that Gutenberg had *not* 'finished' it, either on the 6th November, 1455, or on the previous day of the trial (at the end of October, 1455?). If he had done so, Fust would have had no grounds for demanding the

repayment of his two advances from Gutenberg. Or, if the latter had 'finished' it, or finished it in part, and Fust had yet been bold and unscrupulous enough to sue Gutenberg for repayment, the latter must, no doubt, have had an opportunity of pleading and proving to the Court that he 'had finished the work' for which Fust had advanced the money. But there is no trace of such pleading in Gutenberg's reply, which though it gives a few more details regarding 'the work,' also shows that it could not have been 'finished,' and Gutenberg, like Fust, leaves us in the dark as to whether it had ever been commenced.

Gutenberg stated :

(13) Fust *should* have furnished him with 800 gulden wherewith he [Gutenberg] *should* prepare and make his 'apparatus' [or 'tools'], and he *should* be content with the money, and might devote it to his [own] use; (14) such tools *should* be a pledge to Fust; (15) Fust *should* give him annually 300 g. for maintenance, and also furnish workmen's wages, house-rent, parchment, paper, ink, etc.; (16) if then, further, they did not agree, he *should* return Fust his 800 g. and his tools *should* be free; (17) it was to be well understood that he *should* finish *such* work [i.e., his apparatus or tools] with the money which he [Fust] *had lent him* on his pledge, and (18) he hopes that he had not been bound to [Fust] to spend such 800 g. on 'the work of the books'; (19) Fust had told him that he desired not to take interest; (20) nor had these 800 g. all and at once come to him, in accordance with the contents of the schedule, as [Fust] had pretended in the first article of his claim; (21) of the additional 800 g. he wished to render Fust an account; (22) hence he allows Fust no interest, nor usury, and hopes, therefore, not to be legally indebted to him.

We see that Gutenberg, referring to Fust's share in the business, uses the same word *should* which Fust had used in speaking of Gutenberg's obligations, that is: Gutenberg told the Tribunal (clause 13) that Fust *should* have given him 800 gulden with which he (Gutenberg) *should* make his tools, and (clause 15) Fust *should* annually give him 300 g. for maintenance, etc., etc. Gutenberg likewise uses this word 'should' when speaking of his own obligations: he *should* make his tools with the 800 g., and *should* be content with this money (clause 13); and these tools *should* be Fust's security, etc., etc. (clauses 14-17).

But he does not use this conditional 'should' in clause 17, where he states that Fust *had lent him* money on his pledge; nor in clause 20, where he says that the first 800 g. *had not come* all and at once to him; nor in clause 21, where he states that of the 'additional' 800 g. he wished to give Fust an account.

Therefore, Gutenberg acknowledges to have received from Fust (1) a portion of the first 800, and (2) the whole of the second 800 g. These two points alone are certain; all else *should* have been done, or *should* have been given. But there is no trace of anything having been done or given. It is clear that by this expression *should* the two parties allude to their respective undertakings under their agreement of 1450. It is equally clear that Fust alone had carried out at least some of his obligations when he advanced money for the 'work' in 1450 and 1452. But he had evidently declined, at some time or other, to sink more money in

Gutenberg's undertaking till he saw some result of it. Fust certainly never supplied the annual 300 gulden which Gutenberg had expected from him for his maintenance; nor could he have furnished Gutenberg with workmen's wages, house-rent, etc. (clause 15), for if he had done so he would have added such costly extras to his advances in his account, with the interest thereon.

On the other hand, it is clear that Gutenberg never made his 'tools,' for if he had done so he must be supposed to have delivered them to Fust, to whom he had pledged them even before they were made. And if they had been delivered to Fust, the latter could not have sued Gutenberg for the repayment of his (first) advance, at least not without Gutenberg pleading that he had made them and delivered to Fust. Gutenberg had, indeed, reserved to himself the right to 'redeem' his pledge (that is, his 'tools') by repaying Fust his first 800 gulden. But there is not a word in the whole document to show that Gutenberg had done anything of the kind.

Moreover, Gutenberg's pleading (clause 20) that he had not received the whole of Fust's first 800 gulden (for which he was to manufacture his tools), or at once at the outset of the agreement, shows that for this reason he considered himself released from the obligation of making them.

In clause 17 Gutenberg himself emphasises the fact that he was to finish his tools with the 800 gulden which Fust had lent him on his pledge (*i.e.*, his tools), and he adds (in clause 18) that he hoped that he had not been bound to Fust

to spend such 800 gulden on the 'work of the books.' This clause is the only one which speaks of 'books,' and combined with clause 17, it seems to show that Gutenberg wished to separate *the making of his tools*, to which he was bound, from a 'work of the books,' to which he was not bound, or which was to come afterwards. But as he had not 'finished' the tools pledged to Fust, and supposed to have been intended for the printing of books, it follows that he never had any tools or apparatus for printing. The 'work of the books' could not refer to 'books' printed by Gutenberg before 1450, because the Notarial Instrument shows that in that year he was penniless, and had no property, certainly no press, no types, or anything else to offer to his money-lender, except tools which he had still to make. Nor could Gutenberg have printed books in another office by the help of other people, as Fust may be supposed to have kept an eye on the person so heavily indebted to him.

The verdict of the judges (see 'THE LIBRARY,' 1911, p. 405 *sqq.*) gives us no further light. Gutenberg was to render an account of all his receipts, also of the disbursements which he had laid out on the 'work for the profit of them both'; it also speaks of their 'common good.' Fust in his oath says that he had taken up 1550 gulden, which Gutenberg had received, and which has also gone on 'our common work'; and that of this borrowed money, that had not gone on 'the work of us both,' he demanded interest in accordance with the verdict. But the Sentence does not say,

nor even imply, that anything had been done or left undone, and is, therefore, much more obscure than the depositions of Fust and Gutenberg. Hence we must infer that Gutenberg, not having manufactured his tools, could not have printed anything, either alone or in conjunction with Fust or anybody else.

We may analyze the Helmasperger Record of the Lawsuit between Fust and Gutenberg as much as we please; we may stretch its words and their meaning to the utmost; there is not a syllable to indicate that Gutenberg had invented the art of printing with moveable types.

As to Gutenberg's supposed activity and ceaseless energy of which we hear so much, he evidently spent five years without making the work for which Fust had advanced him money. During that time Fust had apparently waited patiently for some result, though he had not given or done as much as Gutenberg had expected from him. If it had been otherwise the legal proceedings between the two men in November, 1455, would have revealed it, if nothing else. Under the circumstances Fust cannot be blamed for having taken proceedings against Gutenberg; and the latter, after having practically subsisted on borrowed money from 1442 to 1455, was bankrupt in 1457-8, unable to repay his loans or to pay interest on them.

In harmony with the documents—which prove that they know nothing of an invention of printing, nor of Gutenberg as an inventor of that art, either at Strassburg or at Mainz, and also that he

could not have printed before 1450, and very little, if anything at all, after that year—are the colophons of the earliest Mainz books with printed dates (1457 to 1468). They show that during these twelve years the art of printing, far from being treated in that city as a secret, was openly proclaimed and advertised there as a 'by-invention of printing,' and still more distinctly as a '*new* art of printing'; its mechanism is clearly described, and it is pointed out that books were no longer produced by the pen. Such advertisements appear natural and appropriate now that we know that the new art had recently become known at Mainz, not when we assume that Gutenberg had been printing there since 1443, and at Strassburg already before 1436, as some German bibliographers contend. But, though the new art is so distinctly described and advertised at Mainz, we never hear of a 'Mainz invention' or an 'inventor.' Some expressions in the colophons of the 'Grammatica' of 1466, the 'Grammatica' of 1468, and the 'Justinianus' of 1468, which are considered to be allusions to an invention or an inventor, can be explained in a more natural way. The Archbishop of Mainz rewards Gutenberg in 1465 for 'services' rendered to him, but does not say what kind of services they were, nor does he speak of him as an 'inventor.' Dr. Homery, who seems to have assisted Gutenberg with some apparatus for printing, and acknowledges to have received this apparatus back from the Mainz Archbishop after Gutenberg's death in 1468, says nothing about an invention of printing.

At the end of 1468, however, a testimony appears saying that the art of printing 'seemed to have arisen in Germany.' This first allusion to a German invention of printing was made, not at Mainz nor in Germany, but at Rome, in Cardinal Cusa's dedicatory epistle to St. Jerome's Epistles. In 1470 Guil. Fichet, in an edition of the Letters of Gasparinus, printed at Paris, says that Germany is acquainted with the art of printing; Erhard Windsberg says the same also at Paris in 1470. In 1471 Ludov. Carbo said that the Germans had invented printing, and in the same year Nicolas Jenson is mentioned as the inventor of printing. But *circa* 1472 the same Guil. Fichet, who in 1470 only knows that Germany is 'acquainted' with printing, writes a letter to Rob. Gaguin, printed at Paris, in which he says that 'it was rumoured that in Germany, not far from Mainz, a certain Johan Gutenberg first of all invented printing.' In May, 1476, in Peter Schoeffer's third edition of the 'Justinian,' Mainz is for the first time mentioned as the 'inventrix prima' of the art. All later testimonies (see the article 'Typography' in the new 'Encyclopædia Britannica') amplify or corrupt these testimonies.

Therefore, the earliest statements about an invention of printing and an inventor (1468, etc.) come from Italy and France, not from Germany or Mainz; they were made on the strength of Fust and Schoeffer's colophons. Fichet's more precise statement of 1472, four years after Gutenberg's death, was thought to have come from 'Bertolff von Hanauwe,' who appears in Guten-

berg's lawsuit as his servant, and who was printing at Basel in 1468; but it came more likely from information which Fichet obtained from the St. Victor Cathedral, *near* Mainz, as he speaks of the art having been invented 'not far from that town.'

Of this Cathedral Gutenberg became at some time or other (perhaps on his return to Mainz in 1448) a lay-brother, and remained so till his death. From document No. XXI, dated 21st June, 1457 (scarcely two years after his lawsuit with Fust), we see that he was named as a witness in a Notarial Instrument whereby property situated in the village of Bodenheim, near Mainz, was sold to Johann Gensfleisch, junior, husband of the daughter of Gutenberg's brother. The purchaser bound himself to pay annually thirty malters of wheat to the St. Victor Stift. The contract was executed in the house of Leonhard Mengoiss, canon of the Stift. The vellum original, now in the Mainz Town Library, had formerly belonged to the Stift. In the 'Liber fraternitatis' of this same Stift were two undated (but perhaps of 1467-8) entries of his name.

Ivo Wittig, a canon and keeper of the seal of this same Cathedral, erected in the house 'Zum Gutenberg' a memorial stone and epitaph in honour of Gutenberg in 1504; and in 1505, when Joh. Schoeffer published his German Livy, Wittig seems to have written for this work a dedication to the Emperor Maximilian, in which it is stated that Gutenberg was the inventor of printing. This work was reprinted eight times with the same

dedication, while other people at Mainz proclaimed that Fust had invented the art. In this same St. Victor Stift a press was erected in 1541 by Fr. Behem, and his press-reader, Joh. Arnold Bergel, published in that same year an 'Encomium chalcographiae,' in which the lawsuit between Fust and Gutenberg is alluded to for the first time (!), and the invention of printing ascribed to Gutenberg, but in the year 1450 (!).

May we not reasonably infer from Gutenberg's close connection with this Stift that he had been talking there of his having been the first printer in Mainz, and that in this way he came to be regarded as the inventor of printing?

The story of Gutenberg having been the inventor of printing, after having been current from 1472 to 1499, was contradicted in the latter year in the most precise manner by Ulr. Zell, the first printer of Cologne, in the Cologne Chronicle: Gutenberg had only invented printing as it was then (in 1499) generally used, but the prefiguration of the art was found in the Donatuses printed before that time (1450) in Holland.

According to the Haarlem tradition, recorded by Junius, Mainz obtained the art of printing by theft from Haarlem. Without further evidence, however, we do not argue here about this part of the tradition. But recent researches, and the discovery of important additional data (which I hope to publish elsewhere), show that Junius, when telling the manner in which the invention of printing was made at Haarlem, recorded a living tradition based on facts, not mere local gossip or

legendary hearsay. Nearly every point mentioned by him is corroborated by the group of about fifty incunabula known as Costeriana. Even the wooden types mentioned by him can no longer be regarded as an impossibility, since the practicability and facility of making such types and printing with them has satisfactorily been proved by the practical engineer, John Eliot Hodgkin, in vol. II (p. 39 *sqq.*) of his magnificent 'Rariora,' recently published in London (Sampson Low, Marston & Co.).

J. H. HESSELS.

A YEAR'S USE OF THE 'ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA.'

IN the months that have elapsed since the eleventh edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' made its appearance, there has been sufficient time to test the quality of the work and its suitability for its intended purposes. It challenges attention as the largest body of data contributed by experts in every department of human knowledge and investigation. Not only is it written by acknowledged authorities, but it has been fashioned with a definite intention of co-ordination and proportion in the treatment of the mass of subjects dealt with. In the nature of things such an ideal of symmetry can only be approximately successful. Nor could the personal element of style be eliminated, even if it were desirable, for every man has his own way of communicating his knowledge or his ideas. Even grave divines vary from the concise to the flowery; and some, like good Thomas Fuller, cannot exclude flashes of humour from their most serious themes, and their readers as a rule are glad of this inability. But it is a good thing that the editors have kept before them an ideal of proportion as well as of accuracy.

With the remarkable widening of the field of knowledge and investigation that characterised the last century, the importance of encyclopædias has grown immensely. They are no longer a luxury, but a necessity for the large and increasing number who may rightly claim to belong to the educated classes. The present writer, who has contributed to half a dozen encyclopædias, and who has had occasion to consult at least a score, regards no household as complete without one. The children in the home should be encouraged to use the encyclopædia in all their many questionings as to the why and the wherefore, the past and the present of things. Indeed one of the many defects of our modern systems of education is that the pupils in elementary schools, and the students in places of secondary and higher education, are not systematically taught how to use books of reference—indeed, they are scarcely taught how to use books at all. People often go to libraries, and after looking in a subject catalogue for the topic in which they are interested and failing to find the magic word, depart with their desire for information unsatisfied, when all the time the encyclopædia in the open case at their very elbows would have told them exactly what they wanted to know. And it sometimes happens that people do not find in an encyclopædia that which they are seeking, because they do not look in the right place. The tendency, however, of the modern encyclopædia is towards the form of the ‘Konversations-Lexikon,’ and this is certainly the easiest for casual reference.

What then, it will be asked, is the average

student's verdict after a year's use of the ‘Encyclopædia Britannica’? Most readers will, I believe, say it is one of satisfaction. It reaches a high standard of accurate and full statement on important matters, and rarely fails to give some information even on an obscure or little-known subject. Many of its articles are masterpieces of concise exposition, and with the aid of the Index much useful information may be gathered even on subjects on which there is no special article.

The Index must always be consulted (1) if the searcher is in doubt as to where the data he wants is likely to be placed, (2) if he does not find the desired article in the general alphabet, and also (3) if he desires or thinks it possible that there may be side-lights in other articles. Thus, F. F. von Kotzebue's biography comes in vol. xv., but in vol. viii. will be found Dr. A. W. Ward's brief but weighty estimate of his works. So a student of the book of ‘Esther’ will need to consult not only that word, but also the articles ‘Bible,’ ‘Thousand and One Nights,’ for its supposed Persian source, and ‘Targums,’ for two commentaries—of a kind. What outsider to such studies would suppose that there was any connecting link between ‘godly Queen Esther’ and Shirazade? If the student wants to see the influence that the wonderful *megillah* of the Jewish maiden who became a queen has had on two men of genius, he should consult the articles on Handel and Racine. And for the association of her name with the Feast of Lots he must turn to the article ‘Purim.’ So for the Ahikar legends and literature,

the reader must see the articles on 'Achiacharus,' 'Syriac Literature,' and 'Tobit,' before he has exhausted the information the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' can give him.

The notes which follow represent the experiences of a single reader, and can only be offered as such. In the treatment of 'King's Evil,' the writer has restricted himself too strictly to its English history, for the claim of royalty to the healing power was not confined to the British monarchs or to those of France. The 'Cursing Well' of Llaneilian is not overlooked, but an article on Holy Wells would have been acceptable.

The article on Bibliomancy is far too meagre, for divination by books has extended far and wide, and is not a subject to be dismissed with a reference to the *sortes Homericae* and *sortes Virgilianæ*. The Mohammedans use the 'Koran' and the poems of Hafiz, the Hindoos employ the 'Ramayana' and the 'Vedas.' From the earliest ages of the Hebrew and Gentile peoples down to this present day of the enlightened twentieth century divination by books has been practised.

The biography of De Quincey opens with the oft corrected error that he was born at Greenheys, whereas he himself tells us that he was born in the town of Manchester. J. R. Findlay's account was a good one when written, and is a good one still; but it would have been better to have had a fresh article, embodying the result of what has been ascertained in more recent years. It is a pity that there is no reference to Mr. John Albert Green's very useful De Quincey bibliography. The notice

of Acontius, which now appears under the heading of Aconcio, is an improvement on that which appeared in earlier editions; but it does not mention his book, 'Una essortatione al timor di Dio,' long regarded as lost, and of which the unique copy was secured for the British Museum by the late Dr. Garnett, and is described in 'Three Hundred notable Books,' the volume which commemorates his Keepership of the Department of of Printed Books.

The name of Edward Edwards is omitted from the biographies. This is rather unjust to the Father of English Municipal Libraries, who was also a contributor to former editions of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' He is not mentioned in the article on 'Libraries,' which again retails the foolish fable that Sir Walter Raleigh visited Dr. Dee in the building which is now Chetham's Hospital at Manchester. The great municipal libraries of Glasgow, Liverpool, and Manchester are not even named. Dr. Robert Watt is omitted, but William Thomas Lowndes is included. The short notice of Quérard does not mention the English life of him by Ralph Thomas. In the account of Thomas Frognall Dibdin his poems and his novel on 'Cranmer' are ignored.

In Dr. Moses Gaster's excellent account of the gypsies the collection of newspaper cuttings bequeathed by Godfrey Leland to the British Museum is noted, but not the fact that Bataillard's remarkable collection of printed and MS. material for Romany history was bought by the Manchester City Library. Yet it is probably the most im-

portant in existence. The only reference to Grimod de la Reynière is in the article on Cookery. The place is appropriate enough; but the extraordinary man perhaps deserved a fuller notice. In the composite article on S. T. Coleridge there is no reference either to Haney's or to Shepherd's Bibliography. There are two bibliographies of Mrs. Gaskell, but neither of them is mentioned in the article on that delightful novelist. It is an elementary duty for a writer of a literary biography to note the existence of any bibliography of his hero's works. One of the best of individual bibliographies is the late Rev. John Hyde's 'Swedenborg Bibliography,' and this is duly cited in the article on the Swedish seer. It is one of the good signs of the times that these bibliographies of single authors are increasing. There cannot be too many of them, if they are careful and honest. The article on Proclamations would have been very different, it may be conjectured, if fate had allowed the writer to foresee the appearance of two volumes of the 'Bibliotheca Lindesiana,' devoted to that important but little-known topic. Of Friedrich Laun there is no notice either under his pen-name or his family name of Schultze. Yet some of his stories have served as a basis for De Quincey's humorous narratives.

If it is desired to know something of the history and organisation of the Society of Antiquaries, the data supplied by the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' will not be found very satisfactory. For that and for most of the learned societies all that is available is a name, with or without a list of publications.

There is, as a rule, no hint as to the rules or qualifications for membership. 'Academies,' we read, 'have been supplanted socially by the modern club, and intellectually by societies devoted to special branches of science. Those that survive from the past serve, like the Heralds' College, to set an official stamp on literary and scientific merit.' What does this mean exactly? Is the Heralds' College an Academy? And on what merit does it set an official stamp? It is at all events certain that in Great Britain there is no institution disposing of such large money prizes as those available for French men of letters at the hands of the academies.

A pleasant feature is the excellent series of sketches of the literature of various languages. Thus the article on Portuguese Literature enables us to see Gil Vicente and Camillo Castello Branco in their several places in the Lusitanian Parnassus, whilst the separate articles on those authors show their individual achievements. Too little attention is paid in this country to the early developments of the drama in Portugal, and it is to be hoped that the contributions to a better knowledge contained in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' will have an effect in directing students to an attractive and unhackneyed field of research. Apropos of that remarkable but undisciplined genius Castello Branco, it is strange that his 'Romance of a Rich Man' has never been translated into English. His life is full of contrasts; he was born out of wedlock, had a struggling career, abandoned the idea of entering the priesthood, gained a peerage, received a

national pension, and died by his own hand. There are none of his romances so full of unexpected romance as his own stormy career.

The notice of Edwin Waugh, who was the poet-laureate, so to speak, of the Lancashire folk-speech, is less adequate than that of Fritz Reuter, who may be said to occupy a similar position as the interpreter of the Mecklenburg dialect. But the dialect writers are a somewhat neglected race, even in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' although there is a capital sketch of the English dialects. It does not appear to be known to the writers on Alexander John Ellis, to whom the science of phonetics owes so much, that his first venture into literature was a privately printed volume of verse. It is a pity that there is no full biography of a man who made such large sacrifices in the interests of the science of which he was so great a master. His friend and colleague Dr. F. J. Furnivall has been more fortunate. The notice of Jasmin does not mention the life of him by Smiles, and ignores not only the well-intentioned, but somewhat wooden, translations in that volume, but also Longfellow's fine version of 'The Blind Girl of Castel-Cuillé.' Where good English translations exist they should always be mentioned. Longfellow's is a fine one. Cornelius Felton, in a letter printed in the 'Final Memorials of Longfellow,' gives a vivid description of Jasmin's fascinating personality. The 'barber-poet' was a true descendant of the troubadours.

It will not be supposed that these jottings—and they could easily be multiplied—are offered in a capacious spirit; they are not, but as the result of

a regular use of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' No one has a deeper sense of its value than the present writer. It is, when all deductions have been made, the most useful of all books of reference, and represents the combination of learning, research, co-operation and organisation in a higher degree than perhaps any other of the monumental works of literature and science. It is the high-tide mark of human knowledge. And it is knowledge brought to the service of all.

WILLIAM E. A. AXON.

ALBRECHT PFISTER OF BAMBERG.¹

ALBRECHT PFISTER, of Bamberg, like Gutenberg and other patriarchs of early printing, has for centuries continued to be *magni nominis umbra*, although he has a double claim to attention as being the first printer both of illustrated books and of books in the German vernacular. It was, therefore, a happy thought of Dr. Zedler's to devote himself to the task of lightening the darkness that surrounds this figure, and all students of incunabula have reason to be grateful to him for the volume under review. It contains 113 pages of text, and 23 plates of facsimiles, besides other illustrations, and displays as conspicuously as ever the author's extreme thoroughness and capacity for taking pains.

The bulk of Dr. Zedler's monograph is devoted to a detailed examination, first from the typographic and then from the linguistic point of view, of the nine editions known to have issued from Pfister's press. Only two of these are dated (in 1461 and 1462), and only two signed with the printer's name; but Dr. Zedler's analysis of the internal

¹ 'Die Bamberger Pfisterdrucke und die 36zeilige Bibel,' von Prof. Dr. Gottfried Zedler. (Veröffentlichungen der Gutenberg-Gesellschaft, nos. x., xi.)

evidence has enabled him to arrange all the nine with sufficient certainty in chronological order. The sequence starts with an issue of the Ackermann von Böhmen, which survives only in a single copy now at Wolfenbüttel, and which shows many shortcomings in the presswork and setting up, such as can only be due to the printer's inexperience. Then follow in order the 'Wolfenbüttel' issue of Boner's Edelstein (February, 1461), the Vier Historien (May, 1462), a German and a Latin Biblia Pauperum, a second issue of the Ackermann, a second German Biblia Pauperum, the 'Berlin' issue of the Edelstein (published in facsimile by the Graphische Gesellschaft some years ago, with an introduction by Dr. Kristeller), and finally a German Belial, the only one of the series which contains no illustrations. Dr. Zedler's industry has brought together an extraordinary number of minute points of typographical evidence in support of his conclusions, and he has been fortunate enough to find among them no serious contradictions, such as too often stultify attempts to fix the sequence of undated incunabula. It is, however, worth remarking that, by taking but three salient facts out of the mass of Dr. Zedler's data—viz. (1) the irregular presswork of the first Ackermann, (2) the evident priority of the Wolfenbüttel over the Berlin Boner shown by the woodcuts, and already suggested in the 'LIBRARY's' notice of the Berlin facsimile, combined with (3) the distribution of watermarks in each book—we have already sufficient evidence to deduce the same order for the books as Dr. Zedler arrives at.

In this case, at any rate, therefore, the half is not so very much less than the whole—a comforting reflection to those who are conscious of not possessing Dr. Zedler's patience in marshalling multitudes of impalpable details. As to Pfister's presswork generally, Dr. Zedler shows that it was constantly improving, and that he managed to get very satisfactory results out of type that had lost its sharpness even before the 36-line Bible was completed. Incidentally, the theory formerly put forward that Pfister was himself the printer of the Bible is here definitely disposed of by the evidence of the first Ackermann. Although this book was certainly printed later than the Bible, the multifarious 'sorts' of the type are used in it more or less at random, and prove that Pfister was as yet a novice in their manipulation. Dr. Zedler illustrates his contentions by a series of facsimiles which include specimens of every book of the series except the Berlin Edelstein. The reproductions seem very satisfactory, with the exception of plate xxi., where for some unexplained reason 20 lines of the type measure fully 3-5 mm. more than elsewhere. There is also an inaccuracy on p. 3 of the text, where the first edition of the Ackermann is described as containing 18, instead of 24, leaves.

The examination of Pfister's orthography and dialect makes its chief appeal to students of German literature. Dr. Zedler maintains that Pfister edited his texts with more than ordinary care, developing his orthography systematically, and here and there making emendations of his own. There seems, however, to be a not inconsiderable

number of inconsistencies and variations which Dr. Zedler himself admits, and accident or the idiosyncrasies of compositors may perhaps play a more important part in the matter than he would allow. Certainly it is not quite easy to believe that a man who could write such straightforward, if quaint, verse as the rhyming colophon of the *Vier Historien* was really doing his editorial best in the astonishing 'explanation' of Latin law terms on the second page of the *Belial* (p. 39); but this is perhaps scarcely a fair argument, since Dr. Zedler holds on other grounds that the *Belial* shows evident signs of haste and negligence.

The second main section of Dr. Zedler's work, although it comprises only twelve pages, is in point of fact of paramount interest and importance, inasmuch as the information contained in it was hitherto entirely unknown to students of the subject. The point of departure is a notice in the fourth volume, published in 1900, of Looshorn's 'History of the Diocese of Bamberg,' which tells us how in the year 1448 the Chapter of Bamberg Cathedral was about to elect a 'Dompropst' in the room of one Martin von Liechtenstein, who had been incapacitated by illness for several years. A protest against this proceeding, as being contrary to a decree of the Lateran Council, was made by the precentor, Georg von Schaumburg, who had acted as *locum tenens* for Liechtenstein during his illness, and this protest was formally lodged with the Bishop, on behalf of Schaumburg, by his procurator, 'Albertus Pfister, clericus coniugatus Bambergensis diocesis.' Twelve years later, in a

234 ALBRECHT PFISTER OF BAMBERG.

document dated 2nd September, 1460, the name of Pfister occurs once more as that of the secretary of Schaumburg, who had lately himself become Bishop of Bamberg. To these references in Loos-horn Dr. Zedler, by assiduous researches among the Bamberg archives, has been able to add some others. Two of them merely supply a few further details of Pfister's appearance as Schaumburg's procurator on 10th September and 28th September, 1448. The rest, however, are of much greater importance, as they concern the very period during which printing was going on at Bamberg. In looking through the book containing the records of feudal grants made by Bishop Georg, Dr. Zedler came upon two marginal references to a certain quire in another part of the book, which both describe this quire as fairly written by 'the late Albrecht Pfister' (ettwan Albertus Pfister, Albrecht Pfister selig). The second of the marginal references is concerned with a grant made on 13th April, 1466, and according to Dr. Zedler has every appearance of having been written about the same time. If this is correct (and there seems no reason to doubt it), we have conclusive evidence that Pfister was already dead by that date. Further, on examining the portion of the book proved by the marginal notes to be written by Pfister, it was found that his handwriting covers sixteen leaves, comprising records of grants made between 8th January and 11th November, 1460, and occurs nowhere else in the volume. Dr. Zedler suggests that the increasing preoccupation of Pfister with his printing

office, which according to him began its activity about the middle of 1460, caused him to give up his secretarial duties at the end of this year, and this seems probable enough in itself. At the same time, it is a little difficult to reconcile with the calculations made elsewhere in the book as to the time taken by Pfister to print each of his issues. We know from the dates in the respective colophons that fifteen months elapsed between the completion of the Wolfenbüttel Boner (February, 1461) and that of the Vier Historien (May, 1462), and Dr. Zedler inclines to think (p. 43) that the latter book was the only product of the press during that period. But if (as Dr. Zedler says, no doubt correctly) it was the preparation of the woodcuts, rather than the actual printing, which took up most of the time, then the Wolfenbüttel Boner, which contains 101 cuts as compared with 50 (61 with repeats) in the Vier Historien, ought to have taken about two years and a half to complete, and the date of the first Ackermann (and incidentally that of the 36-line Bible) would be thrown as far back as 1458. It is surely more probable that Pfister was not occupied during fifteenth months solely with a comparatively small book like the Vier Historien, but produced besides some other book, now lost. Such a total loss would not be very surprising, considering that even of the extant Pfister books none have survived in more than three copies. But be this as it may, there can be no sort of reasonable doubt that Dr. Zedler is right in his identification of Albrecht Pfister the printer with

Albrecht Pfister the married cleric and secretary to the Bishop of Bamberg, and he is heartily to be congratulated on the happy results of his labours.

More debatable ground is reached in the last section of the monograph, in which Dr. Zedler elaborates his theory that Gutenberg himself, whose finances had by 1457 become hopelessly embarrassed, fled in that year from Mainz to Bamberg, where he printed the 36-line Bible; and this having also proved a disastrous speculation, that he abandoned his type and press and fled back again to Mainz, where he was somehow put in a position to make a fresh start with the Catholicon in 1460. All this is, of course, highly controversial, and it will be sufficient here to mention one or two pieces of evidence given by Dr. Zedler in support of Bamberg as the Bible's place or origin: (1) Of the ten different watermarks found in the Bible none are known to occur in contemporary manuscripts of Mainz origin, while several have been discovered by the author among local manuscripts at Bamberg; (2) all copies of the Bible which bear a mark of ownership came either from Bamberg itself or from some Bavarian monastery; the fragments also were mostly found in monasteries of the Bamberg district; (3) fragments of a printed quire register of the Bible, previously unknown, were discovered by Dr. Zedler and Dr. Freys in Bamberg and the neighbourhood.

J. VICTOR SCHOLDERER.

REVIEWS.

Oxford Books: a bibliography of printed works relating to the University and City of Oxford, or printed or published there. With appendixes, annals and illustrations. Vol. 2. Oxford Literature 1450-1640, and 1641-1650. By Falconer Madan. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. pp. xvi., 712. Price 25s.

IN this second volume on Oxford books, Mr. Madan has substantially carried forward the bibliography of Oxford to which he has devoted the leisure of his life as whole-heartedly as he has devoted his working hours to Bodley and the University. The interest of the new volume is composite. It supplements 'The Early Oxford Press' (Mr. Madan's Catalogue of books printed at Oxford '1468' to 1640, issued seventeen years ago, henceforth to be known as 'Oxford Books. Vol. I.') by adding to it an account of books about Oxford printed elsewhere than at Oxford itself, and also brief, but very interesting 'annals' of Oxford history for each year from 1450 to 1640. A single year, 1641, is then treated in the way which Mr. Madan intended to be normal, the entries under it consisting of (i.) annals, (ii.) descriptions of 'primary' or important books, (iii.) shorter notices of minor pieces, and (iv.) a full record

of the Oxford Press for that year. In 1642 Mr. Madan is overtaken by the Civil War, which brought to Oxford the King and his Court, and no small part of the Royalist army, and kept them there until the King's flight and the subsequent capitulation of the city in June, 1646. The number of pieces here chronicled as issued during this period is no fewer than 886, and the supreme interest of Mr. Madan's bibliography rests on the fact that he has read, or at least skimmed, them all, and with excellent judgment indicated their contents and picked out their plums. Recourse was lightly had to the press, and the result is a picture of the happenings of these four years as they presented themselves to the King's party at Oxford, with a framework of purely University life.

While the main interest of Mr. Madan's book is historical, it is bibliographically important not only for its descriptions and collations, but for its admirable detective work in exposing the spuriousness of the Oxford imprints on many pamphlets and documents really printed in London. As to these, Mr. Madan writes:

As soon as royalist printers in London were impeded or intimidated in their work, they had to choose between giving no imprint at all and giving a false imprint: and the advantages of the latter course secured its general adoption. The pamphlet-readers of London must therefore have been under the impression, from 1642 to 1644, that large numbers of Civil War Tracts on the King's side were smuggled into the City from Oxford, whereas the majority were simply printed or reprinted in London, with counterfeit Oxford imprints. Out of 191 Oxford

imprints in 1642, no less than 58 are London counterfeits; in 1643, 41 out of 238; and in 1644, 24 out of 145. At one period (March 25-April 17, 1644) there are as many false imprints as genuine.

While some London books on which Oxford imprints have been found were themselves originals, in other cases a real Oxford edition existed which the London publisher reprinted without thinking it necessary to explain his own share in the business. Altogether a pretty tangle was created, and Mr. Madan is warmly to be congratulated on the skill with which he has unravelled it.

National Bibliographies: a descriptive catalogue of the works which register the books published in each country. By Robert Alexander Peddie. Grafton & Co. pp. vi., 34. Price 5s.

Mr. Peddie's brief account of the existing National Bibliographies, and of the various works by which the lack of complete National Bibliographies is to some extent supplied, appears (save for a few misprints) to be accurate and useful as far as it goes, but it certainly does not go nearly so far as the price asked for it would reasonably lead a purchaser to expect. When there is very little information to be given, Mr. Peddie cheerfully gives it. When there is much information, which would take trouble to collect and space to set forth, Mr. Peddie looks the situation in the face and passes on. Thus under Canada he states 'there is

no general catalogue of the books published in Canada, but for the province of Quebec there are two catalogues which, though rather summary in form, purport to be inclusive,' and these he describes. On the other hand, under Italy, after noting a similar deficiency, he states 'there are many lists of authors belonging to various towns and provinces with catalogues of their works,' but makes no attempt to enumerate them, though such a list would be very useful. Under the Argentine Republic he mentions Señor Medina's '*Historia y bibliografía de la imprenta en Buenos Aires*,' but under Great Britain there is no mention of any of the three editions of the '*Typographical Antiquities*' of Joseph Ames, nor of the works of Mr. Madan and Mr. Bowes on books printed at Oxford and Cambridge, nor of a dozen other books which, in a five shilling treatise on National Bibliographies, might reasonably claim to be mentioned; even Watt's '*Bibliotheca Britannica*' is not thought worthy of mention. In a book at this price the treatment of Great Britain, which here occupies a bare three pages, should have been at least as full as that in Professor Arber's pioneer article in '*Bibliographica*.' Neither this, by the way, nor the two works of Mr. Growoll on Booktrade Bibliography in England and the United States, are even referred to, though in giving a list of books on any subject it is imperative to include any earlier bibliographies. Altogether this is a disappointing piece of work, and surely Mr. Peddie could have done better.

A. W. P.